

(Roll No. 518)

YEAS—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Bacchus
Barca
Barrett (WT)
Becerra
Bellenson
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Brucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franka (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt

NAYS—224

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Berenger
Bevil
Bibb
Bibb
Blute
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borri
Brewster

Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rose
Roetenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisk
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Long
Synar
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Townes
Traflet
Tucker
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
 Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kyl
LaFalce
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Machley
Mann
Manton
Mansullo
Massoli
McCaulley
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Molloy
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts

NOT VOTING—3

Engel
Neal (NC)
Santorum

□ 1203

Mr. BARLOW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SISISKY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1993

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 2492—making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, and insist on the disagreement to all Senate amendments and request a further conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California. The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIXON, STOKES, and DURBIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. PELOSI, and Messrs. NATCHER, WALSH, ISTOOK, BONILLA, and MCDADE.

There was no objection.

□ 1230

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2862

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from cosponsorship of H.R. 2862.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1627

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1627.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

H.R. 2519—CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 19, 1993, the unfinished business is consideration of Senate amendment number 147 to the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the remaining amendments in disagreement on H.R. 2519, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994: Amendment Nos.: 147, 148, 171, 174, and 175.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO INSERT IN THE RECORD SUMMARY OF TABLES SHOWING COMPARABLE CONFERENCE ACTIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1993 AND 1994

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert a summary of tables showing by department and agencies the conference action compared to the amounts provided for fiscal year 1993, the budget estimates for 1994, and the amounts contained in the House and Senate bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 147: page 59, after line 24, insert:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, \$904,926,000, of which not to exceed \$44,041,000 is available to pay arrearages, the payment of which shall be directed toward special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for arrearage payments to the United Nations until the Secretary of State certifies to the Congress that the United Nations has established an independent office of audits and inspections with responsibilities and powers substantially similar to offices of Inspectors General authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended or that the United Nations has established a mechanism process, or office—

(1) to conduct and supervise audits and investigations of United Nations operations;

(2) to provide leadership and coordination, and to recommend policies, for activities designed—

(A) to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of, and

(B) to prevent and detect fraud and abuse in,

such operations, and

(3) to provide a means for keeping the Secretary-General fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of such operations and the necessity for and progress of corrective action: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, may propose that the Secretary-General of the United Nations establish an advisory committee to assist in the creation within the United Nations of such mechanism, process, or office: *Provided further*, That an advisory committee established consistent with the proceeding proviso should be comprised of the permanent representatives to the United Nations from 15 countries having a commitment or interest in budgetary and management reform of the United Nations, including a wide range of contributing countries and developing countries representing the various regional groupings of countries in the United Nations: *Provided further*, That such advisory committee should evaluate and make recommendations regarding the efforts of the United Nations and its specialized agencies—

(i) to establish a system of cost-based accounting;

(ii) to continue the practice of conducting internal audits;

(iii) to remedy any irregularities found by such audits; and

(iv) to make arrangements for regular, independent audits of United Nations operations: *Provided further*, That it is the sense of the Congress that even tougher measures to achieve reform should be put in place in the event that the withholding of arrearages does not achieve necessary reform in the United Nations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States con-

tribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

POLICY ON THE REMOVAL OF RUSSIAN ARMED FORCES FROM THE BALTIC STATES

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the armed forces of the former Soviet Union currently under control of the Russian Federation, continue to be deployed on the territory of the sovereign and independent Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania against the wishes of the Baltic peoples and their governments;

(2) the stationing of military forces on the territory of another sovereign state against the will of that state is contrary to international law;

(3) the presence of Russian military forces in the Baltic States may present a destabilizing effect on the governments of these states;

(4) the governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have demanded that the Russian Federation remove such forces from their territories;

(5) Article 15 of the July 1992 Helsinki Summit Declaration of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe specifically calls for the conclusion, without delay, of appropriate bilateral agreements, including timetables for the "early, orderly and complete withdrawal of such foreign troops from the territories of the Baltic States";

(6) the United States is aware of the difficulties facing the Russian Federation in resettling Russian soldiers and their families in Russia, and that the lack of housing is a factor in the expeditious removal of Russian troops;

(7) the United States is committed to providing assistance to the Russian Federation for construction of housing and job retraining for returning troops in an attempt to help alleviate this burden; and

(8) the United States is encouraged by the progress achieved thus far in removal of such troops, and welcomes the agreement reached between the Russian Federation and Lithuania establishing the August 1993 deadline for troop removal.

(b) POLICY.—The Congress calls upon the Government of the Russian Federation to continue to remove its troops from the independent Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania through a firm, expeditious, and conscientiously observed schedule.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, \$860,885,000: *Provided*, That any payment of arrearages made from these funds shall be directed toward special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: *Provided further*, That of the funds

appropriated in this paragraph for the assessed contribution of the United States to the United Nations, ten percent of said assessment shall be available for obligation only upon a certification to the Congress by the Secretary of State that the United Nations has established an independent office with responsibilities and powers substantially similar to offices of Inspectors General authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

□ 1210

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment now that funds the general budget of the United Nations. I rise in strong support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and I will tell you why.

This bill is \$52 million below the 1993 account. It is \$97.7 million below the request. It is \$44 million below the Senate level and it is \$27.7 million below what our subcommittee had recommended to the full House before it was stricken on a point of order, so this number is the lowest possible number that we could possibly derive out of these proceedings here today.

This amendment funds our contributions not only to the United Nations, but also to all the other international organizations that we provide money for; for example, the International Atomic Energy Agency; but Mr. Speaker, more important in my judgment than a dollar figure in this bill is the fact that for the first time today if we pass this amendment we are reforming the United Nations.

How? Because in this bill we withhold 10 percent of the contributions to the United Nations until they certify that they have an independent inspector general to weed out waste, fraud, abuse, and report it to the Secretary General and assumably to the member nations, such as the United States.

As the Speaker knows, we fund 25 percent of the general budget of the United Nations. Many of us think that is too high a figure and would like to see it reduced, and I would hope that the authorizing committee would take that up.

Germany pays 8 percent. Japan pays 12 percent, and that is just not right.

This 1946-set figure may have been realistic in that day, but it is certainly not realistic today.

So this provision, put in at the conference level at the request of the House conferees, withholds 10 percent

of our U.N. contribution until they certify they have an inspector general.

Now, 2 weeks ago, 420 Members of this body voted to instruct our conferees to put a provision in the conference report withholding this funding until the United Nations establishes an inspector general. We have that provision in this bill, so you have a chance to vote again now on the actual provision that you instructed us to put in the bill 2 weeks ago, and I would hope that you would follow us on this motion.

So if you want U.N. reform, Mr. Speaker, you want to go for this conference report if this provision should come to a vote.

Now, some people have said, "Well, what's the problem? What kind of waste or mismanagement is there in the United Nations that needs this attention?"

I would just point out that for several decades we have been trying in the U.S. Government, both the executive and the legislative branches, to force the United Nations to appoint some sort of inspector general to police its own actions. All to no avail.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is involved in 18 peacekeeping missions around the world. Do you know how many of the 14,000 employees in the U.N. headquarters is in the command and control of some 90,000 troops around the world in 18 different peacekeeping missions? Thirty, Mr. Speaker, 30 and only 9 of those are military type people.

You wonder why these so-called peacekeeping missions around the world are going awry and leaderless, it is because the United Nations spends all their money on bureaucrats, not involved in the peacekeeping mission, only 30 they have assigned to these 90,000 troops around the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am for the United Nations. I do not want to give the idea that this is a "Bash the U.N. Day," but I think we are entitled as the one-fourth sponsor of this group to have some kind of accountability back to this body about how our tax dollars are being spent.

I would point out to you that it is upward of \$300 million every year just for the general account of the United Nations.

Richard Thornburgh who was our former Attorney General and then went to the United Nations as a Deputy and came back and filed a very lengthy volume, his report on the shortcomings in bookkeeping and accounting at the United Nations. I commend that reading to you.

It is no wonder that he found:

Too many deadwood employees doing too little work and too few staff members doing too much.

In the words of some employees of the United Nations that were quoted in the Chicago Tribune lately:

The United Nations has become a repository for guys who want to go to cocktail par-

ties in Geneva to celebrate somebody's national day.

According to an Arab officer of the U.N. Agency in Somalia:

We are not doing anything here. It is just bureaucracy.

A University of Chicago professor who has extensively studied the United Nations told a U.S. panel recently:

Hiring for U.N. offices was rather like patronage in the old Chicago Streets and Sanitation Department. That Streets and Sanitation Department actually picked up garbage, while the United Nations only complains about it.

The United Nations gives very lavish benefits and salaries to their employees. Salaries are guaranteed at rates 15 to 20 percent higher than the highest comparable private sector salaries, and by the way, those salaries are tax free, Mr. Speaker. They have guaranteed cost-of-living increases. They get payments to cover up to 75 percent of all education costs of their children, including college.

No wonder people from Third World countries around the world almost kill to get these jobs in New York at the United Nations. They make more than the national leaders back in their home countries and have much more benefits in most cases.

There are numerous reports of special financial arrangements. Mr. Speaker, given to U.N. officials who have been removed from their jobs or retirees. For example, two very high-ranking bureaucrats recently were given lucrative consulting contracts after their jobs were eliminated. One now earns \$18,000 a month, Mr. Speaker, double his former salary from which he was fired at the United Nations.

One U.N. official was quoted in the Washington Post as saying:

United Nations rules on consultants' payments are violated all over the place. The latest cases are just the tip of the iceberg.

Other examples: Recent suspension of eight high-ranking U.N. peacekeeping procurement officers on charges of procurement fraud.

□ 1220

All attempts so far to get the United Nations to launch real reform, Mr. Speaker, have fallen on deaf ears. I think it is time that we seized control of this thing. It is the only choice left to us.

Some time back we, the Congress, installed a 25-percent cap on the share the United States gives to the United Nations. We did that unilaterally. There is no reason why we should not also do this. So I ask that we include this amendment that 10 percent of all the funds that we contribute be withheld until it is certified to us that an inspector general has been appointed by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, we do not call it an inspector general. We call it an auditing officer, but the auditing officer has the same powers and responsibilities as the inspector generals in our departments

of the U.S. Government have—nothing less, nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, I ask approval of this motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, former Attorney General Thornburgh went to work for the United Nations, and he made a recommendation earlier this year that the United Nations establish an inspector general. Ambassador Albright, as soon as she arrived there, said she agreed with that. We are all in agreement with the United Nations having an inspector general.

What I want to warn the Members about, though, is this: There are different definitions of "inspector general." Some inspector generals that we have in the departments of this Government represent waste themselves. They have entirely too big a bureaucracy, two or three times the number of people they ought to have to do the job that they are expected to do. Many of them are merely auditing the books, all the books in the department that have already been audited. Instead of that, what they are supposed to do is investigate, find out what may be wrong, and report to the top management. In this case, that would be the members of the Security Council, as well as the Secretary General of the United Nations.

That is what we want them to do. We do not want this to be an excuse, though. When we demand that they have an inspector general, we do not want this to be an excuse for them to build up a bureaucracy and have waste like we have in some of our departments.

We are all in agreement. The United Nations needs an inspector-general that would do what they need to have done, and this would help our people at the United Nations to impress upon other members of the United Nations that we need to get on with this business and appoint an inspector general.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was listening very intently to what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] just said, and I hope my colleagues were paying attention as well.

Seventy-five percent of the expenses of some of the U.N. employees' children's colleges are being paid for by the United Nations. I do not know how many of our colleagues here have our Government's and our taxpayers' dollars paying for 75 percent of our college education. Yet our tax dollars are going over there to do just that.

There are 179 or 180 countries in the United Nations, and we are paying 25 percent of the costs. Imagine that, that

is 25 percent of the cost, and it makes no sense. They are getting us into problems all around the world. I just found out that in 1987 there were under 10,000 U.N. peacekeepers around the world, and now they have 90,000.

This administration has been going along with this, and our U.N. Ambassador has gotten us into places like Rwanda, Macedonia, Somalia, and elsewhere, and we are all going along with it and we are still paying the freight.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] just raised issue after issue after issue where there is a waste of funds, theft of funds, and an excessive use of funds. And we are going to do what? We are going to withhold 10 percent.

I think we should make a real slash in our U.N. commitment until they change this thing, until they quit making these crazy decisions. We as a nation should not be allowing our young people to be subservient to U.N. command and to go to these places throughout the world.

We just saw 18 young men killed last week in Somalia. They were under a U.N. commander. That is a mistake. I understand that in Macedonia we have 300 American young people who are under a Danish commander. He may be very competent, but a lot of people in this country would question whether or not we ought to have 300 young American fighting men or women under a foreign commander of Danish descent.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues that the \$361 million that we are talking about appropriating, 25 percent of all the money going to the United Nations, with much of it being wasted or squandered or stolen, should not go there, that we should not send it, and instead we should send a very strong signal.

So I say to my colleagues on the floor here today, let us go back to the drawing boards on this. Instead of just withholding 10 percent, let us cut. Let us cut maybe 25 percent. That would send a strong signal for them to clean up their act.

Urging them to get an inspector general is fine, and I congratulate the gentleman for moving in that direction, but once we control the pocketbook and control their money, they start paying attention. If we would cut, let us say, a couple of hundred million dollars out of this, which would be applauded by the American taxpayers, the people at the United Nations would really get the message.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just continue for a few seconds, and then I will be happy to yield to my colleague.

I also understand that they have many employees over there. Did the gentleman tell me how many employees they had just a minute ago?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, 14,000.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. All right, 14,000 employees. And the gentleman said that only about 30 of them were

involved in peacekeeping, yet we are providing \$401 million or \$402 million for the peacekeeping effort, and out of 14,000 employees they assign 30 people. That is totally inadequate.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to correct the number the gentleman had earlier mentioned. The amount in this bill for the United Nations general budget contribution itself is \$291 million. The \$360.9 million figure includes many other international organizations like the International Atomic Energy Agency, and so forth.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I see. The U.N. number is \$291 million, and you are going to withhold how much?

Mr. ROGERS. Ten percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Ten percent. If it is \$291 million and we are paying 25 percent of the total cost, let us just cut it by \$50 million to send a signal. If we want them to clean up their act over there, the easiest way to do it is to hold funds back or cut them off.

Can you imagine this? I hope the American people are paying attention to this debate. Some of those people are getting 75 percent of their children's college education paid for with money coming out of the United Nations, and we are providing 25 percent of those funds. That is crazy. There are 179 countries that are represented at the United Nations, and we are paying one-fourth? Give me a break.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention to the gentleman that for 4 years in the 80's, we withheld one quarter of our assessment each year so that we were appropriating in the last quarter of the calendar year for which the assessment was due instead of appropriating the funds in the calendar year before the payments were due.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. How much?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That was done in order to get them to do some things that we wanted them to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, our committee was in full support of that process it was the Reagan administration at the time. Four years the administration decided that we ought to start paying these arrearages on the basis of 20 percent a year for 5 years.

The amount we were supposed to pay in this year was \$97 million on arrearages. We do not have those funds in this bill. So what I am telling the gentleman is that we have cut \$97 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. But let me just say that evidently nobody at the United Nations, neither Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali or anybody else over there, is getting the message, because if they are getting fringe benefits to the degree I just heard from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], somebody over there is not listening. They should not be getting our American tax dollars to pay for their kids' college educations in the first place, let alone 75 percent.

In addition to that, the gentleman told us that these people who have been fired would then come back with lucrative contracts that are worth more than double their previous pay. What is going on over there?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if they do not get the \$79 million, the United Nations is going to get the message because they are depending on it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will object to this motion to concur because I think the message should be stronger, I think the message should be louder, and I think the American people would agree to that after what we heard today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman might be interpreted as objecting because we did not put the \$97 million in.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody who has heard this debate will misunderstand my intention.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will wrap up in a very brief statement here. I appreciate the concerns of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and all of the others who are similarly concerned. That is the same motivation that moved us to not only put this 10 percent withholding in this bill until the United Nations appoints that inspector general to root out the kinds of things that we are talking about. Not only is that 10 percent in there, but let me point out again, they requested \$97.7 million more than we are giving in this bill. We are \$44 million below the Senate level in the bill. We are \$27.7 million below the figure that our subcommittee earlier had come up with and then was knocked out on a point of order on the floor. And we are \$52 million below the 1993 figure.

So they are getting a pretty loud message, not just from the 10 percent withholding, but from the tremendous cuts that we are putting in the overall account. So if they do not get the message, Mr. Speaker, they are deaf, dumb, and blind.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me ask this question: Has there been any indication that the abuses the gentleman talked about just a few minutes ago are being addressed? Has anybody over there indicated they are going to change these policies?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would point out to the gentleman that Attorney General Thornburgh, who then became a deputy at the United Nations, in his report which formed the basis of my thinking about what should be done, says no, they have not yet. But we have not had a chance to act on that Thornburgh report until now. So if we adopt the chairman's position, you are adopting, number one, reform at the United Nations; you are adopting the 10 percent withholding; you are adopting these big cuts in their funding from this year's level and everybody else's level. It is sending a giant message up there. If that does not work, then there will be further action.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying and appreciate his attempts and the attempts of the chairman to do this. But it seems to me if Mr. Thornburgh has reported that even though we have been withholding funds and are in arrears that they continue to do these things, even just the arrearages alone are the problem, then I think we ought to not just send a giant message, but maybe a ball bat with a nail in it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a yes vote on this means you really want to call to the attention of the United Nations that they had better move and put reform in place. A no vote means you are very satisfied with the ways things are going.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

(Roll No. 519)

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Dias-Balart	Jacobs
Ackerman	Dickey	Jefferson
Allard	Dicks	Johnson (CT)
Andrews (ME)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Andrews (NJ)	Dixon	Johnson (SD)
Andrews (TX)	Doolley	Johnson, E. B.
Applegate	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Dorman	Johnston
Armey	Dreier	Kanjorski
Bacchus (FL)	Duncan	Kaptur
Bacchus (AL)	Dunn	Kasich
Baesler	Durbin	Kennedy
Baker (CA)	Edwards (CA)	Kennelly
Baker (LA)	Edwards (TX)	Kildee
Ballenger	Emerson	Kim
Barca	English (OK)	Kingston
Barcia	Eshoo	Kloczka
Barlow	Evans	Klein
Barrett (NE)	Everett	Klink
Barrett (WI)	Ewing	Klug
Bartlett	Farr	Knollenberg
Barton	Fawell	Kolbe
Bateman	Fazio	Kopetaki
Becerra	Fields (LA)	Kreidler
Beilenson	Fields (TX)	Kyl
Bentley	Filner	LaFalce
Bereuter	Fingerhut	Lambert
Berman	Fish	Lancaster
Bevill	Flake	Lantos
Bilbray	Feigletta	LaRocco
Bilirakis	Ford (MI)	Laughlin
Bishop	Ford (TN)	Lazio
Blackwell	Fowler	Leach
Bliley	Frank (MA)	Leahman
Blute	Franks (CT)	Levin
Boehlert	Franks (NJ)	Levy
Boehner	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Bonilla	Furse	Lewis (FL)
Bonior	Galleghy	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Gallo	Lightfoot
Boucher	Gejdenson	Linder
Brewster	Gekas	Lipinski
Brooks	Gephardt	Livingston
Browder	Geren	Lloyd
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	Long
Brown (FL)	Gilchrest	Lowey
Brown (OH)	Gillman	Machtley
Bryant	Gingrich	Maloney
Bunning	Glickman	Mann
Buyer	Gonzales	Manton
Byrne	Goodlatte	Mantulio
Callahan	Goodling	Margolies
Calvert	Gordon	Meekins
Camp	Ocas	Markley
Canady	Grams	Martinez
Canwell	Green	Matsui
Cardin	Gunderson	Massoli
Carr	Gutierrez	McCandless
Castle	Hall (OH)	McCloskey
Chapman	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Clay	Hamburg	McCrery
Clayton	Hamilton	McCurdy
Clement	Hancock	McDade
Clinger	Hansen	McDermott
Clyburn	Harnan	McHale
Coble	Hastert	McHugh
Coleman	Hastings	McInnis
Collins (GA)	Hayes	McKeon
Collins (IL)	Hefley	McKinney
Collins (MI)	Hefner	McNulty
Combest	Henger	Meehan
Condit	Hilliard	Meek
Conyers	Hinchey	Menendez
Cooper	Roagland	Meyers
Coppersmith	Hobson	Mfume
Costello	Hochbrueckner	Mica
Cox	Hoeckstra	Miller (CA)
Coyne	Hoke	Miller (FL)
Cramer	Holden	Mineta
Crane	Horn	Minge
Crisp	Houghton	Mink
Cunningham	Hoyer	Molasky
Danner	Muffington	Molinari
Darden	Hughes	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hunter	Montgomery
Deal	Hutchinson	Moorhead
DeFazio	Hutto	Moran
DeLauro	Hyde	Morella
DeLay	Inglis	Murphy
Dellums	Inhofe	Murtha
Derrick	Inslee	Myers
Deutch	Latoka	

Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roe-Lehtinen

Ross
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarbanes
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shapiro
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Siskis
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds

Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tausch
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velasquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmann
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—2

Burton

Stump

NOT VOTING—9

Engel
English (AZ)
Gillmor

Grandy
Greenwood
McMillan
Michol
Waters
Warman

□ 1253

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 148: Page 60, line 5, strike out "\$422,499,000" and insert "\$444,736,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$401,607,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] seek time on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. ROGERS. I seek time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the last amendment dealt with the contribution to the general budget of the United Nations. This amendment deals with the contributions we make to the United Nations for peacekeeping operations, so Members should listen up.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious subject, because in the last 3 months our delegate in the United Nations from the United States has supported, and the Security Council has adopted, four brandnew peacekeeping missions somewhere around the world, including Rwanda and Liberia and others. The United Nations is engaged in 18 peacekeeping missions around the world with 90,000 troops, some 13,000 of whom are Americans, including Somalia. There are some 10 applications pending for more peacekeeping missions.

Not only are we talking about the loss of American lives and blood, but also American money, because in the past we have been billed for 31.7 percent of the total U.N. peacekeeping budget. I would point out to the Members that is now amounting to over \$1 billion, just the American part.

Mr. Speaker, there are just no controls that this body has on how much money we get obligated to pay to the United Nations without any decisions being made on our part. The United Nations votes to go to a peacekeeping mission and then they send us the bill, 31.7 percent of it. What choice do we have in it? None. What checks do we have on making sure the right decision was made in the first place? None.

Mr. Speaker, we have launched an initiative that was included in the statement of managers in this section of the bill that instructs the Secretary of State to notify the Congress 15 days in advance before our Ambassador in the United Nations votes for any new or expanded or changed peacekeeping missions. Had we had had this provision before Somalia went bad, Mr. Speaker, we would have at least had 15 days notice of the change of mission or the fact we were going there in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we are not seeking prior approval of the decision of whether or not our Ambassador votes for a peacekeeping mission. I doubt we can do that, but we can require that they notify us of their intent to seek a peacekeeping mission in the Security Council. Why? Because we have to budget for it, Mr. Speaker. We have to find the money for it. Their requirement this year is about \$1.3 billion. We are giving them \$898 million less than the require-

ment. It is \$58.7 million below the 1993 level. This is \$21 million below the House-passed level. It is \$43 million below the Senate-passed level. It is \$43 million less than the request.

Mr. Speaker, we are sending a message just by the dollar figure, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, is this requirement that this administration give us notice 15 days before they seek a new peacekeeping mission in the United Nations. There is nothing extraordinary about that. It should have been done all along.

No. 2, in the statement of managers we also say we want to cut our share of this peacekeeping assessment to 25 percent. It is now 31.7 percent. Until the first of the year it was 30.4 percent. They keep increasing it.

We say no way. We cannot even pay the 25 percent, but we are going to say we are not going to pay more than 25 percent, regardless, and we are cutting back down to the same level that we support the general budget of the United Nations.

□ 1300

No. 3, in this statement of managers we say we expect the administration to submit a report to the Congress on how they are going to improve their peace-making and peacekeeping policy in these missions around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all support the United Nations. We understand the importance of alliances in battling the problems in the world. I do not think any of us want to throw away the impact of the United Nations or the other multilateral organizations.

However, I think we have to realize that there are limitations on what the United Nations can do as a body, and we are going to have to realize that if we are going to pay the costs, and be the leader of these missions with blood, then the United States needs to have more impact in the decisions in the first place. So that is what these provisions attempt to do.

The United Nations, Mr. Speaker, has 14,000 employees at their headquarters. Do Members know how many of those 14,000 employees are working on overseeing these military peacekeeping missions around the world? Guess? Would you say a third, a fourth? I wish that were so. There are 30, 30 people in the United Nations headquarters overseeing 18 peacekeeping missions around the world, Mr. Speaker, with 90,000 troops, 25,000 of whom are American boys and girls. There are 30 people in command and control in New York City. Suppose you get in trouble somewhere in one of these missions, half a day off timewise over there, and they call headquarters. Will they be open at 12 midnight in New York City time or 3 a.m.? I do not know. Will they be there on weekends? They have only got 30 people to oversee all of these missions. That is hardly enough to oversee a company of Rangers, let alone 90,000 troops.

So, Mr. Speaker, this language will at least give the Congress notice of any new peacekeeping missions that are planned. It will require the administration to tell us what it is going to cost, how long we are to be there, and the goals of that mission. At least the administration must be forced to refine in their own minds and for planning purposes all of these items in advance before they vote to send our money and our blood onto these foreign shores.

I do not think that is unreasonable, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I think it is utterly reasonable and necessary, and should be done, and should have been done a long time ago.

So, I urge the adoption of the chairman's motion. His motion cuts peacekeeping even below the House-passed level, coupled with this very strong language. It puts the administration on notice that the Congress will not look kindly on future U.N. peacekeeping missions when it has not been consulted first, and we have not been consulted in these last four that have been voted in the United Nations by our delegate there.

So, I urge the adoption of this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very concerned about the cost of peacekeeping, and also about the worth of peacekeeping for many years.

We heard about UNIFIL. That was the peacekeeping force between Lebanon and Israel. But we sent some investigators over there several years ago, and they came back and said it had very little value. Since that time we have seen that it does not have much value because when the Israelis wanted to take a shortcut someplace, they just smashed down the gate and went through the middle.

The United Nations has a problem. They say well, we will set up some peacekeeping operations and they say we took care of a problem.

The value of these peacekeeping operations is very limited I think. The cost has been going up astronomically. I believe, if I remember correctly, about 10 years ago, the cost was about \$65 million.

Then in fiscal year 1993 the request was \$753 million, but we appropriated \$460 million. We gave them \$293 million less than they requested. I think that sent a message that the United Nations needed to get serious, because there is not going to be the kind of money there, especially when it is going to come out of salaries and expenses of the State Department. There is a cap on how much you can spend for our international organizations and operations.

The United Nations has started looking into the rate at which we are paying. The rates were established for the various nations in 1973. The assess-

ments to the United Nations are determined on the gross national product of the various countries. Obviously the gross national product has changed a great deal since 1973.

Since 1973 our assessment for peacekeeping has been 30.4 percent. So in the fall of 1992, the administration at that time sought to cut it to the regular budget assessment of 25 percent. This effort was complicated by the breakup of the Soviet Union because those new Republics could not pay at the same rate. So instead of cutting the U.S. assessment back to 30.4 percent, our assessment went up to 31.7 percent.

We have never paid the 31.7 percent. We were successful in securing a freeze at 30.4 percent, pending completion of a study which is now being made, and it will be presented to the United Nations during this session of the General Assembly.

Our representatives at the United Nations, and I was up there in the spring and talked to all five of the Ambassadors and to some others, are determined when this study is completed to negotiate for a much lower rate. And that is what we should have done I think 3 or 4 years ago. They know that it is a serious problem and that any increase that we have in the assessments that are paid will have to come one way or another out of the salaries and expenses for the State Department.

It is a serious matter, and I think they recognize it.

In fiscal year 1993 the request for peacekeeping was \$753 million, and we gave them \$460 million. So we came up short last year \$293 million.

This year the request was for \$619 million, and we have included \$401 million, which is \$219 million less than they requested. Those figures should tell Members that we are serious about not paying this 30.4 percent, especially when it is going to come out of salaries and expenses and other funds that we need in this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say a while ago that about 10 years ago the amount of money expended for peacekeeping forces around the world by the United States through the United Nations was about \$40 million.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was \$65 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I just wanted to confirm that for my presentation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is my memory, and it has been going up substantially in the last several years.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And it is too high I think, and they know that we are serious about it at the United Nations. And when Ambassador Albright was before us in the spring at the hearing, she indicated it was a concern. The

administration is going to negotiate a better deal than we have now. They will have to or they will not have the money.

□ 1310

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues know, I serve as ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on International Operations, which has jurisdiction over the State Department and other foreign affairs agencies.

I would like to congratulate the managers of this bill, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] for their product. In general, the funding contained in this bill for the foreign affairs agencies is fiscally responsible and stays with House-passed authorization levels. I have been working for years to restrain budget growth in the foreign affairs agencies, and I am pleased that this appropriation accomplishes exactly that. This bill actually cuts funding for the foreign affairs agencies over \$350 million below the existing appropriated level.

I am pleased by the funding cuts and report language contained in this bill for the United Nations and for the international peacekeeping account. This bill places a badly needed brake on the runaway growth in U.N. peacekeeping activities. I added an amendment to the State Department authorization addressing this problem, and I am grateful that the appropriations bill follows up on this issue.

The appropriations conference report calls on the administration to report to Congress 15 days prior to approving any new peacekeeping missions. While the report language asks the administration to notify the Appropriations Committees, I would like to emphasize the importance of prior 15-day notification of the Foreign Affairs Committee as well. In the past 4 weeks and without any consultation with Congress, the administration approved three new nation-building peacekeeping operations for Haiti, Rwanda, and Liberia. This was done though it was clear that appropriations were insufficient even to pay for existing peacekeeping operations.

Today, there are 18 U.N. peacekeeping operations, 15 of which were established since 1990. In 1987, the United Nations spent \$233 million on all of its international peacekeeping operations, compared to \$3.8 billion budgeted for this function in 1993. The current funding level does not even count the cost of the three new U.N. nation-building operations, which have an estimated cost of \$253 million just for the first 6 months. And if the proposed 50,000 peacekeeping force for Bosnia were approved, it would immediately double

the U.N. peacekeeping budget to nearly \$8 billion.

Furthermore, until this year the United States was overbilled at a 30.4-percent rate for all U.N. peacekeeping costs, compared to the 25 percent U.S. assessment level for the regular U.N. budget. But in January of this year, the United Nations unilaterally raised the U.S. peacekeeping assessment even further to 31.7 percent without any protest by the new administration. The report language in this conference report calls for a moratorium on any new U.N. peacekeeping operations until the United Nations agrees to reduce the U.S. assessment to no more than 25 percent.

Today, the United Nations is placing a new emphasis on direct military intervention into internal conflicts. The dangers of what Ambassador Madeline Albright has termed assertive multilateralism were graphically displayed in the back alleys of South Mogadishu and on the docks of Port-au-Prince.

For the cost of this new form of U.N. interventionism is not just runaway spending, but the lives of American troops. I am extremely concerned that U.S. soldiers are increasingly being called not just to defend vital American interests, but to advance nebulous U.N. nation-building goals. Just this weekend I attended the funeral in Lincoln, ME, for M. Sgt. Gary Gordon, who was killed in action 2 weeks ago in Somalia. I regret that because of my congressional duties I was unable to attend a funeral earlier in the week of S. Sgt. Thomas Field of Lisbon, ME, who also lost his life in Somalia. Maine may be a small State, but patriotism runs strong and Mainers serve proudly in our Nation's Armed Forces. We must be sure that our own Government always keeps its faith with these brave men and women.

So again, I would like to congratulate the Republican manager of this bill, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for insisting on forceful action on this timely issue.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute additional to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with what the gentlewoman said except one thing. I think maybe the gentlewoman made an error when she said there was no protest against the 31.7 assessment rate. Both the last administration and this administration have refused to recognize that increase.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with much of what my colleagues have said, and I think they are moving in the right direction. The fact of the matter is that in 1978 there were 10,000 U.N. peacekeeping troops around the world. And now there are over 90,000.

The gentlewoman just expressed her concern that it is expanding, we are going into nation-building in other parts of the world, and I agree with that. We are still going to be spending 25 percent of the total U.N. budget for peacekeeping forces around the world. Why should we be doing that? I do not understand; I simply cannot understand why we are going to pick up 25 percent of the freight when we are not 25 percent of the world's land mass, we are not 25 percent of the world's population. Of the 90,000 troops in the field right now, over one-fourth of those are young American men and women. Why are we providing the lion's share of that? Why is, for instance, Japan providing only 12.5 percent and Germany providing only 8.9 percent while we are assessed 31.7 percent? Even 25 percent is too much.

It seems to me we ought to send a much stronger signal. I agree with the 15 days' advance notice. I agree with a lot of the things that my colleagues have been talking about. But it seems to me we should not be sending \$402 million when just 10 years ago the total amount of spending for the U.N. peacekeeping efforts was \$40 million.

The U.S. participation is going to be 10 times what it was 10 years ago for the whole world. It seems to me that \$402 million is excessive.

Mr. Speaker, we have severe budgetary problems in this country. Everybody knows what the national debt is, what the deficit is, and what the interest on that debt is. Yet we are sending 10 times what the total United Nations peacekeeping costs were 10 years ago, just from the United States alone. And I think that is excessive.

Now, if we want to control what the United Nations is doing as far as sending peacekeeping troops around the world, the best way to do it is with the dollars; if you do not send them the money, they cannot send those people around out in the field.

I agree that getting 15 days' advance notice, if possible, from our U.S. Ambassador is a step in the right direction, but more than that should be done. We should not be sending at this time \$402 million to the United Nations for this effort. We just should not be doing it. They are making mistakes doing it.

Boutros-Ghali has made numerous mistakes that have not only cost us lives but millions and maybe ultimately billions of dollars.

We went into Somalia to feed the starving masses, and then we got into nation building. As we just heard from the gentlewoman a few moments ago, there are three or four more nations that we are going to be nation building. These people do not want nation-

building. They want food and they want other things, but they do not want us to come in telling them how to run their country.

Our tax dollars, \$402 million of them, is going to be used, in large part, for that purpose. I do not believe the American people want that. I believe the American people would like to see this cut dramatically. I think we should cut it.

So, I will object and I will ask for a rollcall vote on this. I do not expect a lot of support, because this is a cut and people coming in and saying, "Well, you are already cutting. How are you going to explain that back home?" Well, I think you can refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this debate. I want to cut more. I do not think we should be sending 25 percent. We should be sending a lot less than that, if any, a lot less than that, and we should be controlling what is going on over there instead of just protesting.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman realize that we in this bill are appropriating \$402 million; does the gentleman know how much they requested?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. \$642 million.

Mr. ROGERS. Their requirement was \$1.3 billion. That is not the request, that is the amount they say it would take to pay their bills. They now currently estimate for the 18 ongoing missions.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. They requested \$642 million.

Mr. ROGERS. That is right, the request was that. But they say it would take \$1.3 billion to pay all the bills, our share of the bills, they say. So, we are \$898 million less than that figure, and we are \$43 million less than their official request, lower than the Senate and the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman a question. Let me just say one thing. If my children said that they wanted a Chevrolet and they knew that I was in a negotiating mood, they would probably ask for a Mercedes or a Cadillac. And I submit to you we do not have a lot of morons over there at the United Nations. They are probably asking for an excessive amount of money, knowing that we are going to compromise down like we do on every other single thing around this place. But the fact of the matter is, 10 years ago the total amount of expenditures for U.N. peacekeeping was about \$40 million, according to the chairman, for all the worldwide costs. All the countries of the world kicked in for that, \$40 million. Today we are going to be appropriating \$402 million, 10 times that, just for the United States share. Granted, that is a lot less than they requested.

□ 1320

We should not be giving them 25 percent and we most certainly should not be giving them all the young American men and women who are sacrificing their lives and everything else in these various God-forsaken places, and we should not be giving them \$402 million in American taxpayer dollars.

Let us send this back to the conference committee and cut this figure.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of our committee.

(Mr. LIGHTFOOT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I would say to our distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and to our ranking member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], listening to their voices, we have a veterinary back in Iowa who could probably fix that problem. It is kind of a red liquid in a bottle, but I am not sure it has been approved by the FDA.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about peacekeeping and we discussed it here on the floor some last night. I think one of the things that I do not believe is a partisan issue, that there is very strong agreement on both sides of the aisle that we are treading into some dangerous waters with these peacekeeping efforts. We have heard that from both Republicans and Democrats alike.

I think there is one thing probably that is driving a lot of that. In the instance of the United States, the young men and women who we are sending off to do these peacekeeping missions raised their hands and took an oath to put their lives on the line for their country. Quite frankly, some of the people who are promoting peacekeeping have never had the will or the backbone to do that. That is creating some problems, at least in our thought processes.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] pointed out, and I think accurately so, why are we spending these kinds of dollars in countries that we cannot even pronounce, in which we have absolutely no national interest whatsoever? I think it is a good point and it is a good question that we need to answer.

One of the things that concerns me a great deal about this whole process is Presidential Decision Directive 13, which has been kept very conveniently out of the public's eye. President Clinton in that PDD 13 has stated that he wants to place U.S. troops under the command of U.N. or foreign commanders. He states in that directive that he wants to eliminate the law which puts a cap on the number of U.S. soldiers that can be committed to a U.N. peacekeeping effort.

In that directive he wants to share our intelligence with members of the United Nations. We have not seen that here in the Congress. I think that is where a lot of the consternation is coming from, that so much of this is being done behind our backs and around the corner.

By putting in this 15-day notification, at least it is a step in the right direction.

By reducing the amount of funding that has been asked for is a step in the right direction.

I would agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that it needs to go further, but I think if we can show our will here as a group that we are going to put the reins on the United Nations and try through the IG process to shake out the cronyism and the absolute corruption that is from the basement of that building to the attic and everywhere in between, that the people of the United States represented by those of us who were sent here finally have said it is time to draw the line on the shenanigans in the United Nations, then we have accomplished something and we can get the American people to continue to support us in that measure. Then possibly we can do something constructive in reforming the United Nations.

A lot of us would like to see it abolished, quite frankly, but as Mr. MacDougal, a member of the U.S. Commission on Reporting the Effectiveness of the United Nations, made the comment if this unit were to be constructed as it is now, no one could possibly conceive of ever putting something together that was like the United Nations. As it currently exists, it does not make any sense at all. It is a huge power play by a lot of little countries around the world who basically are prospering at the behest of the American taxpayer and on the blood of American citizens.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am prepared to conclude.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the money reductions that we have in this conference report, there are four major provisions in the Statement of Managers. The dollar figures, first off, were 10 percent below their request, were 13 percent below what we gave them in 1993, were 223 percent below what they say is their actual requirements for peacekeeping in 1994, were 5 percent below what the House figure was and were 10 percent below what the Senate figure was; so our conference came way down, I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], even from all the other levels, including the House and the Senate; so we have made substantial cuts in the amount of money that we are giving to the United Nations for peacekeeping operations.

Then in addition to that cut are these four provisions in the statement of managers:

One. We instruct the administration to conduct a thorough review of the

current process of committing to peacekeeping operations. Change, we are saying, the way you actually commit us to these operations.

Two. We Say to the United Nations, we are not going to accept more than 25 percent of these peacekeeping costs, if that much. We are not going to pay the 31.7 percent that you arbitrarily billed us for. If we pay anything, it will be no more than 25 percent.

Three. The statement of managers says that the administration shall undertake badly needed organizational and management changes to carry out peacekeeping activities effectively. We are not happy with the way you are carrying out these peacekeeping operations. Change, we are saying.

Then number four is an instruction of 15 days' notice to the Congress. Before you want to go into another new peacekeeping operation, all we ask is just 2 weeks' notice, and in that notice we want to know where you are proposing to take us.

Number two, How much is it going to cost?

Three. What is the mission? What are you trying to achieve there? What is the goal of the mission?

Four. How long are you going to be there?

And five, How are you going to pay for it? What source of U.S. funding are you going to use to pay for it, reprogramming, a budget amendment, a supplemental request, just what?

We think these are reasonable requests and we think that the State Department and the administration would be very well-advised to follow the requests that we are making in this statement of managers, because this is the subcommittee, after all, that you will be looking to for future funding of all the activities of the State Department, the United Nations and so forth, so we think they will be reasonable in adhering to these simple requests.

Now, in the event that does not take place, Mr. Speaker, I filed a free-standing bill yesterday that incorporates the 15 days' notice for new peacekeeping operations. Members are invited to sign on to the bill. I do not know the number, but you can find that out. If you would like to be a part of that bill that we want to make into the law, then I would urge Members to sign on to that bill.

I would point out that what we are talking about today, though, is merely language in the Statement of Managers to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]. It is altogether fair and reasonable. We have the figures. We have reforms built into the United Nations and U.S. procedures here and we think we have made tremendous progress toward cutting costs, cutting our share and putting in place some significant changes and reforms that are desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for a provision included in the con-

ference report to accompany H.R. 2519, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal 1994.

Included in the conference report is a provision for a grant from the Small Business Administration to the city of Prestonsburg, KY, for small business development. It is my understanding this grant will be used to help design and construct a Mountain Arts Center in Prestonsburg, KY. This center will be a tremendous boon to small businesses in an economically depressed area. Not only will the project stimulate small businesses throughout the area during the construction phase of the project, once completed, the center will be a boon for small business creation and development through the increased tourism and economic activity which will be attracted.

I am grateful for its inclusion in the conference report.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just for a brief summary.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are making some progress. We had soldiers in Lebanon. This subcommittee went over to Lebanon several years ago, looked the situation over, and came back and said immediately, "Get those boys out of there. They should not even be there."

I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] went over there with his subcommittee. He came back and was concerned. About 2 weeks later, you know what happened. We lost 250 boys.

Soldiers from major nations are sort of a target. They are a built-in target. It is better to have soldiers from Third World countries in these peacekeeping operations.

□ 1330

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "If you do establish peacekeeping forces, there's very little they can do, go in, and set up a camp, and put a guard around the perimeter. What more can they do? They are not going to fight anybody."

So, there is very limited value, I think, to some of these peacekeeping operations but in the last year we finally have been getting attention on this. I think that last year the last administration finally recognized that this is a serious problem and that could not continue to escalate the cost, and this administration, I know, believes that because I talked to them about it a number of times.

So, what we have here is a request for \$619 million, and we are cutting it back to \$401 million, a reduction of \$218 million, and a yes vote on this would mean endorsement of the approach that we are taking, and, if my colleagues do not believe we ought to do that, then they can vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 61, not voting 5, as follows:

(Roll No. 520)

YEAS—367

Abercrombie	Delums	Horn
Ackerman	Derriok	Houghton
Andrews (ME)	Deutch	Hoyer
Andrews (NJ)	Dias-Baiart	Huffington
Andrews (TX)	Dickey	Hughes
Applegate	Dicks	Hutchinson
Armey	Dingell	Hutto
Bacchus (FL)	Dixone	Hyde
Baceler	Dooley	Inglis
Bailenger	Dreier	Inisee
Baras	Dunn	Istook
Barlow	Durbin	Jefferson
Barrett (NE)	Edwards (GA)	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (WI)	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (GA)
Bateman	English (AZ)	Johnson (SD)
Beccerra	English (OK)	Johnson, M. B.
Bellenson	Eaboo	Johnson, Sam
Bentley	Evans	Johnston
Bereuter	Everett	Kanjorski
Berman	Ewing	Kapner
Beverly	Farr	Kasich
Bilbray	Fawell	Kennedy
Bishop	Fazio	Kennelly
Blackwell	Fields (LA)	Kildee
Bliley	Filner	King
Blute	Fingerhut	Kingston
Boehlert	Fish	Klooska
Boehner	Flake	Klein
Bondar	Foglietta	Klink
Borski	Ford (MI)	Knollenberg
Boehner	Ford (TN)	Kolbe
Brewster	Fowler	Kopetski
Brooks	Frank (MA)	Kreidler
Browder	Frank (CT)	Kyl
Brown (CA)	Frank (NJ)	LaFalce
Brown (FL)	Frost	Lambert
Brown (OH)	Furse	Lancaster
Bryant	Gallagher	Lantos
Bunning	Gallo	LaRocco
Buyer	Gejdenson	Laughlin
Byrne	Gephardt	Lasio
Callahan	Geron	Leach
Calvert	Gibbons	Lehman
Camp	Gilchrist	Levin
Canady	Gillmor	Levy
Cantwell	Gillman	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Gingrich	Linder
Carr	Glickman	Lipinski
Castle	Goodlatte	Livingston
Chapman	Goodling	Lloyd
Clay	Gordon	Long
Clayton	Goos	Lowe
Clement	Grams	Maohitley
Clinger	Grandy	Maloney
Clyburn	Green	Mann
Coleman	Greenwood	Mann
Collins (IL)	Gunderson	Margolies-
Collins (MI)	Gutierrez	Mesivinsky
Condit	Hall (OH)	Marky
Cooper	Hamburg	Martinez
Copperwheat	Hamilton	Matsui
Cosentino	Harman	Maselli
Cox	Hastert	McCandless
Coyne	Hastings	McCloskey
Cramer	Hayes	McCollum
Crapo	Hefner	McCreary
Danner	Hilliard	McCurdy
Darden	Hogeland	McDade
de la Garza	Hobson	McDermott
Deal	Hochbrueckner	McHale
DeFazio	Hoke	McKeon
DeLauro	Holden	McKinney

McNulty	Pryce (OH)	Stark
Meenan	Quillen	Stearns
Meek	Rahall	Stenholm
Menendez	Ramstad	Stokes
Meyers	Rangel	Strickland
Mfume	Reed	Studds
Mica	Regula	Stupak
Michel	Reynolds	Sundquist
Miller (FL)	Richardson	Sweet
Mineta	Ridge	Swift
Minge	Roberts	Synar
Mink	Roemer	Talent
Moakley	Rogers	Tanner
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Tausin
Montgomery	Roe-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Moorhead	Rose	Taylor (NC)
Moran	Rostenkowski	Tejeda
Morella	Roukema	Thomas (CA)
Murphy	Rowland	Thomas (WY)
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Thompson
Myers	Royce	Thomson
Nadler	Rush	Thurman
Natcher	Sabo	Torkildsen
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Torres
Neal (NO)	Santorum	Torricelli
Nussle	Sarbanes	Towns
Oberstar	Sarpallius	Tucker
Obey	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Oliver	Saxton	Valentine
Ortiz	Schaben	Velasquez
Orton	Schiff	Vento
Owens	Schroeder	Vlasicovsky
Oxley	Schumer	Volkmer
Packard	Scott	Vucanovich
Pallone	Serrano	Washington
Parker	Sharp	Walters
Pastor	Shaw	Watt
Paxon	Shays	Waxman
Payne (NJ)	Shepherd	Weldon
Payne (VA)	Siskaly	Wheat
Pelosi	Skaggs	Whitten
Penny	Skeen	Williams
Petersen (FL)	Skelton	Wilson
Petersen (MN)	Slattery	Wise
Pickett	Slaughter	Wolf
Pickles	Smith (IA)	Woolsey
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)	Wyden
Porter	Smith (OR)	Wynn
Portman	Smith (TX)	Yates
Poshard	Snowe	Young (FL)
Price (NC)	Spratt	

NAYS—61

Allard	Fields (TX)	Petri
Archer	Gekas	Pombo
Bachus (AL)	Gonzales	Quinn
Baker (CA)	Hall (TX)	Ravenel
Baker (LA)	Hancock	Roth
Barcia	Hansen	Schaefer
Bartlett	Hefley	Sensenbrenner
Barton	Herrger	Shuster
Bilirakis	Hoekstra	Smith (MI)
Bonilla	Hunter	Solomon
Burton	Inhofe	Spence
Coble	Jacobs	Stump
Coilins (GA)	Kim	Trafficant
Combest	King	Upton
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Walker
Cunningham	Lewis (FL)	Walsh
DeLay	Lightfoot	Young (AK)
Doolittle	Mansullo	Zeliff
Dorman	McHugh	Zimmer
Duncan	McInnis	
Emerson	Molinari	

NOT VOTING—5

Conyers	Hinchey	Miller (CA)
Engel	McMillan	

□ 1353

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. KIM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. KENNELLY, and Messrs. PETERSON of Florida, ABERCROMBIE, CAMP, and MOORHEAD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 171: Page 68, after line 26, insert:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

For grants made by the United States Information Agency to the National Endowment for Democracy as authorized by the National Endowment for Democracy Act, \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be disbursed to grantees who have not reimbursed the National Endowment for Democracy, from nongovernmental funds, for disallowed expenditures by such grantees for first class travel, alcohol and entertainment, identified in the March 1993 report of the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] wish time on this motion?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] seek time on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] oppose the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 17 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], and that he have the right to yield to others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] will be recognized for 17 minutes and, in turn, have the right to yield time. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will retain 3 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisi-

ana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of our committee.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take the well and speak on behalf of the National Endowment for Democracy and hope that this body will recede to the Senate amendment which included some \$35 million in funding.

The White House had requested \$50 million. If we pass this \$35 million, it will be a bargain for this country. And, it will be a bargain for democracy all throughout the world.

That \$35 million will go to grantees, including the Democrat and Republican Party Institutes, and institutes linked to the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce and numerous other private voluntary organizations who send people throughout the world with meager resources to encourage countries to study the democratic system and become democratic, free nations.

NED is a small, cost-effective, non-governmental institution. It has the bipartisan support of the current administration as well as all former living Presidents who regard it as an investment in a safer world, beneficial to American security and economic interests.

NED is a dynamic, flexible and cost-effective means of furthering United States interests by promoting the development of stable democracies in strategic, important parts of the world. NED provides aid to democratic movements around the globe by dispatching experts to help those seeking freedom to assemble the building blocks necessary to sustain a stable and democratic system, including representative political parties, a free market economy, independent trade unions and a free press.

I can say definitively to this body that the predecessor of NED helped fund the AFL-CIO go to El Salvador and plant the seeds of democracy there, while the Communists were trying to take over that country by force. Likewise, the AFL-CIO went to Poland to establish a framework of support for Solidarity, which ultimately led not only to freedom and democracy in Poland, but also to the collapse of the Soviet empire. NED is now all over the globe, helping privatization in Russia, helping Bulgaria write their constitution, helping Ukraine solve their economic problems, and helping democracy establish roots in Latin America. The list goes on and on.

This is a good program. It works. It is cost-effective.

□ 1400

By promoting democracy around the world, this proposal is in our national interest, and this money is an investment in a peaceful future so the United States can spend less on defense and more on our own people. It is the best

deal going. I urge the adoption of the motion.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I bring up this issue, the National Endowment for Democracy, again. It is almost 4 months to the day that we addressed this same matter in the House, and the House chose to eliminate NED by a resounding vote of 247 to 171. NED's fate was then sent to the other body where it was debated on the Senate floor. I have to say that any Member of the House that read Senator BUMPERS' statement on this can appreciate what I would like to say today, but will not take the time.

Obviously, the proponents of the NED think that it is totally responsible for the breakdown of the Soviet Union and the emergence of democracy throughout the world. If only we had known in early 1980 that for a mere \$35 million we could have saved \$2 trillion in defense and other foreign aid, we would have looked like geniuses in the Congress.

I would say that, one, my opposition to this is based on the fact that the Founding Fathers in our Constitution directed that the President of the United States through the State Department, should carry on the foreign affairs of this country. NED is a divergence from that principle. Through NED taxpayers' money is delegated and earmarked specifically for a private fund to use as it will, without any direct accountability as to how those funds are expended, and no oversight by this Congress. I think that is one fundamental mistake.

Two, this organization in the past, over the past 8 years, has funded such things as campaigns in Great Britain, France, and New Zealand. I do not know what is wrong with these nations' democracies, but I would suggest that they may have been democratic for a few years and the American taxpayers' money, one, is not necessary to keep them democratic, but two, quite an intrusion by one great democracy in the democracies of others.

Often we find that NED money is spent promoting programs that are in contradiction of known American policy. I think we need that to be brought into check by putting all of this entity under the State Department and under the executive branch as intended by the Constitution.

Finally, it is hard to argue against the National Endowment for Democracy, because my friends say I am not a Democrat. I resent that, but there is nothing that can be said to that. Let me tell the Members what the real name of this organization should be: The National Endowment for the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the AFL-CIO, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that is who it really funds. Maybe another name should be the Political Consultants Relief Act of 1993, because that is who it funds, the Washington "beltway bandits" that operate

in our campaigns and presidential campaigns, but in off years like to sell their wares around this world, instilling their political information and ability to emerging parties or democracies.

I suggest, one, Mr. Speaker, that is an insult. Two, that is not building the know-how of how to carry on democratic campaigns in other countries. It is financing the consultants in this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Members, I have watched this House run under tremendous pressure when we defeated SSC yesterday. I have also seen us try to eliminate or run in other projects or programs, but never have I seen a harder lobbying effort by all the former Presidents, by all the leadership on both the Democratic side and the Republican side, by all the people who are anything in this town, and most of all, by the estate of our commentators and our journalists throughout the United States.

I think it is unfortunate that, the 30 or 40 votes that made the difference last time have probably been changed by this pressure. I think we are going to lose this, and I think the lobbyists and the political forces of this city and this country and the journalists of America have done their work well.

I think they are going to change 30 or 40 votes from that June 22 vote, but all it attests to is what Mr. Perot said: The people who are wearing the Gucci shoes and carrying the alligator bags are going to prove again in this town that they can do their job and do it well when they are at risk.

It is unfortunate for democracy, that we cannot, in 1993, send the message that we will not spend 17.5 percent more this year than we spent last year for an endowment that does well at some things but is questionable on other things. The fact of the matter is that all of those things could be accomplished by a direct contract between the State Department and any other private entity, including the Endowment for Democracy, if the worthwhile work is worth supporting. At least if the State Department were involved, we would have programmatic accountability.

I would urge my colleagues to hold tight with that vote we made in June, and send the proper message to the American people that their representatives are trying to take a responsible budgetary course in this country, and not letting our economy and our Nation go to rot.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I have laryngitis, so I am not going to talk very much. I think that if all these people are lobbying, that they would not have, any of them, contacted the chairman of the subcommittee that is handling the bill.

October 20, 1993

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 8229

I have not heard from any of those people.

I will tell the Members who I have heard from, or who did make an impression on me. I was in Albania, there was not a country that was more despotic than Albania. The new President of Albania said:

The greatest thing that ever helped me was the National Endowment for Democracy.

He said:

Those people came over here; they are not a part of your government, they are independent, but they came over here and told me about how private organizations work.

If any of the Members have been to Albania, they know what it is. It is a country filled with pillboxes. The former dictator filled it with pillboxes. The Albanians had no freedom at all, had no idea how to operate these institutions. The President of Albania said:

Those people came over here and they did the best service that anybody could possibly

do. Nobody from our government could have done that.

I think this is a very good investment at \$35 million.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insist a table which compares conference agreement for the items funded in the bill with the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1993, the amount requested for fiscal year 1994, and the House and Senate bills.

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
Bill (H.R. 2519)**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice Assistance	865,299,000	865,652,000	860,000,000	863,314,000	879,805,000	+ 14,306,000
(Transfer out)					-500,000	-500,000
Law Enforcement Personnel (H.R. 2118 Supp.)	150,000,000					-150,000,000
Public safety officers benefits program:						
Death benefits	28,013,000	28,936,000	28,936,000	28,936,000	28,936,000	+ 923,000
Disability benefits		2,000,000				
Total, Office of Justice Programs	843,312,000	866,588,000	878,936,000	712,250,000	708,041,000	-135,271,000
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	115,929,000	119,289,000	117,199,000	115,000,000	119,000,000	+ 3,071,000
Advance appropriation		20,000,000			20,000,000	+ 20,000,000
Repeal of Advance Appropriation				-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Office of Inspector General	30,822,000	30,898,000	30,898,000	30,723,000	30,000,000	-822,000
Quantico Training Center	7,700,000					-7,700,000
Weed and Seed Fund	13,150,000	13,482,000	12,829,000	13,150,000	13,150,000	
Federal/State partnerships		100,000,000				
Total	167,401,000	263,679,000	180,923,000	158,873,000	162,150,000	-5,251,000
United States Parole Commission						
Salaries and expenses	9,309,000	9,385,000	9,385,000	9,123,000	9,123,000	-186,000
Legal Activities						
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	395,500,000	409,984,000	400,968,000	400,066,000	403,968,000	+ 8,468,000
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund	2,000,000	3,000,000	1,900,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Independent counsel (permanent, indefinite)	4,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-500,000
Civil liberties public education fund (permanent, definite)	500,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-400,000,000
Civil liberties public education fund		5,000,000				
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	44,826,000	44,817,000	44,817,000	43,092,000	45,997,000	+ 1,371,000
Offsetting fee collections	(18,900,000)	(17,275,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(20,820,000)	(+ 3,820,000)
Total budget authority available	(61,526,800)	(62,092,000)	(63,817,000)	(62,092,000)	(66,817,000)	(+ 5,291,000)
Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys	768,300,000	808,797,000	808,797,000	818,797,000	813,797,000	+ 45,497,000
Assets forfeiture fund surplus	22,400,000					-22,400,000
Total budget authority available	790,700,000	808,797,000	808,797,000	818,797,000	813,797,000	+ 23,097,000
United States Trustee System Fund	57,221,000	57,350,000	56,521,000	46,150,000	61,513,000	+ 4,292,000
Offsetting fee collections	(32,300,000)	(37,487,000)	(37,487,000)	(53,687,000)	(37,487,000)	(+ 5,187,000)
Total budget authority available	(88,521,000)	(84,837,000)	(84,006,000)	(89,837,000)	(99,000,000)	(+ 9,479,000)
Salaries and expenses, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	898,000	940,000	940,000	898,000	940,000	+ 42,000
Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service	333,300,000	339,808,000	339,808,000	339,808,000	339,808,000	+ 6,508,000
Support of United States prisoners	234,125,000	319,384,000	307,700,000	312,884,000	312,884,000	+ 78,759,000
Assets forfeiture fund surplus	27,800,000					-27,800,000
Total budget authority available	261,725,000	319,384,000	307,700,000	312,884,000	312,884,000	+ 61,159,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	81,010,000	103,022,000	103,022,000	103,022,000	103,022,000	+ 22,012,000
D.C. Informant Protection		1,400,000				
Total budget authority available	81,010,000	104,422,000	103,022,000	103,022,000	103,022,000	+ 22,012,000
Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service	26,106,000	34,545,000	26,792,000	26,106,000	26,106,000	
Assets forfeiture Fund (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	58,000,000	63,000,000	60,275,000	58,000,000	55,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, Legal activities	2,555,586,000	2,296,047,000	2,258,540,000	2,254,843,000	2,268,035,000	-286,551,000
Radiation Exposure Compensation						
Administrative expenses	2,722,000	2,722,000	2,588,000	2,668,000	2,668,000	-54,000
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	170,750,000	250,000				-170,750,000
Total	173,472,000	2,972,000	2,588,000	2,668,000	2,668,000	-170,804,000
Interagency Law Enforcement						
Organized crime drug enforcement	385,248,000	384,381,000	384,381,000	382,381,000	382,381,000	-2,867,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	1,932,023,000	1,978,006,000	1,949,305,000	1,954,305,000	1,954,305,000	+ 22,282,000
Identification division automation	75,400,000	84,400,000	75,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	+ 9,000,000
Total	2,007,423,000	2,062,406,000	2,024,705,000	2,038,705,000	2,038,705,000	+ 31,282,000

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
Bill (H.R. 2519) - Continued**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	718,684,000	731,839,000	718,684,000	727,161,000	722,000,000	+ 3,318,000
Diversion control fund.....	(12,000,000)	(42,123,000)	(42,123,000)	(42,123,000)	(42,123,000)	(+ 30,123,000)
Total budget authority available.....	(730,684,000)	(773,762,000)	(760,807,000)	(769,284,000)	(764,123,000)	(+ 33,439,000)
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses.....	965,000,000	1,094,052,000	1,059,000,000	1,048,538,000	1,048,538,000	+ 83,538,000
Immigration legalization fund.....	(8,281,000)	(2,248,000)	(2,248,000)	(2,248,000)	(2,248,000)	(+ 6,033,000)
Immigration user fund.....	(253,808,000)	(3,016,000)	(255,016,000)	(255,016,000)	(305,016,000)	(+ 51,408,000)
Land border inspection fund.....	(4,000,000)	(4,094,000)	(17,094,000)	(17,094,000)	(17,094,000)	(+ 13,094,000)
Immigration examinations fund.....	(337,415,000)	(347,529,000)	(347,529,000)	(347,529,000)	(347,529,000)	(+ 10,114,000)
Breached bond fund.....	(5,000,000)	(5,900,000)	(5,900,000)	(5,900,000)	(5,900,000)	(+ 900,000)
Immigration Emergency Fund.....		6,000,000			6,000,000	+ 6,000,000
Total budget authority available.....	(1,573,304,000)	(1,714,836,000)	(1,686,787,000)	(1,678,325,000)	(1,732,325,000)	(+ 159,021,000)
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses.....	1,681,822,000	1,968,003,000	1,950,000,000	1,971,615,000	1,950,000,000	+ 268,178,000
Prior year carryover.....	(40,000,000)					(+ 40,000,000)
Transfer of excess criminal fines.....	(53,000,000)					(+ 63,000,000)
Offsetting fee collections.....		(48,360,000)	(48,360,000)	(48,360,000)	(48,360,000)	(+ 48,360,000)
Total budget authority available.....	(1,784,822,000)	(2,036,363,000)	(1,998,360,000)	(2,019,975,000)	(1,998,360,000)	(+ 213,538,000)
Proposed fees, offsetting receipts.....	-48,360,000					+ 48,360,000
National Institute of Corrections.....	10,250,000	10,211,000	10,211,000	9,995,000	10,211,000	-39,000
Buildings and facilities (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.).....	194,225,000	278,850,000	175,000,000	351,850,000	269,543,000	+ 75,318,000
Transfer from assets forfeiture fund.....		20,000,000				
Subtotal.....	194,225,000	278,850,000	195,000,000	351,850,000	269,543,000	+ 75,318,000
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,181,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,100,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,395,000)	(+ 214,000)
Total.....	1,637,837,000	2,275,064,000	2,155,211,000	2,333,460,000	2,229,754,000	+ 391,817,000
Total, Department of Justice.....	9,663,372,000	9,839,212,000	9,449,351,000	9,568,002,000	9,578,895,000	-84,477,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,181,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,100,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,395,000)	(+ 214,000)
RELATED AGENCIES						
Commission on Civil Rights						
Salaries and expenses.....	7,776,000	7,923,000	7,565,000	7,923,000	7,776,000	
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	222,000,000	234,845,000	230,000,000	227,305,000	230,000,000	+ 8,000,000
Federal Communications Commission						
Salaries and expenses (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.).....	140,000,000	129,889,000	129,889,000	129,889,000	99,900,000	-40,100,000
Offsetting fee collections.....		(18,105,000)			(60,400,000)	(+ 60,400,000)
Total budget authority available.....	(140,000,000)	(145,994,000)	(129,889,000)	(129,889,000)	(160,300,000)	(+ 20,300,000)
Federal Maritime Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	18,300,000	19,450,000	18,383,000	19,450,000	18,900,000	+ 600,000
Federal Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	69,850,000	71,740,000	69,740,000	69,740,000	67,820,000	+ 1,730,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	(18,500,000)	(17,275,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(20,820,000)	(+ 3,920,000)
Total budget authority available.....	(86,550,000)	(89,015,000)	(88,740,000)	(88,740,000)	(88,740,000)	(+ 2,190,000)
National Commission to Support Law Enforcement						
Salaries and expenses.....			500,000		500,000	+ 500,000
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.).....	115,535,000	57,856,000	57,856,000	57,856,000	57,856,000	-57,679,000
Offsetting fee collections - new.....	(96,000,000)			(172,000,000)	(171,821,000)	(+ 75,821,000)
Offsetting fee collections - carryover.....	(30,000,000)			(31,238,000)	(30,840,000)	(+ 640,000)
Investment Advisor Fee.....		18,587,000				
Investment advisor fee offsetting receipt.....		-18,587,000				
Special Fund (Registration Fees).....		180,000,000				
Offsetting receipts.....		-180,000,000				
Total budget authority available.....	(241,535,000)	(57,856,000)	(57,856,000)	(261,004,000)	(260,317,000)	(+ 18,782,000)

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
Bill (H.R. 2519) - Continued**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
State Justice Institute						
Salaries and expenses 1/	13,550,000	20,000,000	13,550,000	13,000,000	13,550,000
Total, related agencies	588,811,000	541,703,000	527,483,000	525,163,000	496,402,000	-90,409,000
Total, title I, Department of Justice and related agencies	10,250,183,000	10,380,915,000	9,976,834,000	10,193,165,000	10,074,797,000	-175,386,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,181,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,100,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,395,000)	(+ 214,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific and technical research and services	182,940,000	240,988,000	210,000,000	240,988,000	226,000,000	+ 33,060,000
(Transfer out)	-1,500,000	-1,500,000
Industrial technology services	88,087,000	232,524,000	232,524,000	232,524,000	+ 148,457,000
Construction of research facilities	105,000,000	61,686,000	61,686,000	61,686,000	-43,314,000
Total	384,007,000	535,198,000	210,000,000	535,198,000	518,710,000	+ 134,703,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research & facilities (inc. HR 2118 Supp)	1,519,872,000	1,757,872,000	1,650,000,000	1,685,000,000	1,694,753,000	+ 174,881,000
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(55,000,000)	(61,400,000)	(55,544,800)	(54,000,000)	(54,800,000)	(+200,000)
(By transfer from Damage assessment & restoration revolving fund, permanent)	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	+ 1,500,000
(Damage assessment & restoration revolving fund)	-17,508,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	+ 16,006,000
Total	1,502,366,000	1,757,872,000	1,650,000,000	1,685,000,000	1,694,753,000	+ 182,387,000
Construction	94,500,000	79,063,000	89,775,000	109,703,000	109,703,000	+ 15,203,000
Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion	30,000,000	23,064,000	23,064,000	77,064,000	77,064,000	+ 47,064,000
Aircraft procurement and modernization	48,000,000	43,000,000	-43,000,000
Fishing vessel obligations guarantee	470,000	458,000	459,000	459,000	-11,000
Fishing vessel and gear damage fund	1,306,000	1,335,000	1,273,000	1,273,000	1,273,000	-33,000
Fishermen's contingency fund	1,025,000	1,051,000	999,000	999,000	999,000	-26,000
Foreign fishing observer fund	565,000	564,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	-15,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	1,630,232,000	1,862,749,000	1,766,120,000	1,921,048,000	1,927,801,000	+ 297,569,000
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	31,712,000	38,042,000	33,042,000	31,712,000	33,042,000	+ 1,330,000
Office of Inspector General	15,805,000	18,381,000	15,860,000	16,500,000	16,000,000	+ 195,000
Working capital fund (transfer in)	1,500,000	+ 1,500,000
Total	47,517,000	56,423,000	48,902,000	48,212,000	50,542,000	+ 3,025,000
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses	123,955,000	140,798,000	131,170,000	128,286,000	128,286,000	+ 4,331,000
Periodic censuses and programs	173,300,000	130,918,000	110,000,000	120,084,000	110,000,000	-63,300,000
Total	297,255,000	271,716,000	241,170,000	248,370,000	238,286,000	-58,969,000
Economic and Statistical Analysis						
Salaries and expenses	39,353,000	49,802,000	45,220,000	45,220,000	45,220,000	+ 5,867,000
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration	213,851,000	246,333,000	221,445,000	251,103,000	248,580,000	+ 34,739,000
Export Administration						
Operations and administration	41,015,000	34,747,000	34,747,000	34,747,000	34,747,000	-6,268,000
Minority Business Development Agency						
Minority business development	37,889,000	45,381,000	38,362,000	43,381,000	42,100,000	+ 4,211,000
United States Travel and Tourism Administration						
Salaries and expenses	15,806,000	20,298,000	20,298,000	17,120,000	+ 1,512,000
Proposed fees, offsetting receipts	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Patent and Trademark Office						
Salaries and expenses	86,672,000	103,000,000	88,329,000	88,329,000	88,329,000	+ 1,857,000
Technology Administration						
Salaries and expenses	4,450,000	5,425,000	4,500,000	6,000,000	5,700,000	+ 1,250,000
National Technical Information Service						
NTIS revolving fund	8,000,000	-8,000,000
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Salaries and expenses	17,900,000	21,827,000	18,827,000	20,927,000	19,927,000	+ 2,027,000
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction	21,320,000	20,636,000	20,254,000	28,000,000	24,000,000	+ 2,680,000

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
BJN (H.R. 2519) - Continued**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Endowment for Children's Educational Television	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Information Infrastructure grants		51,000,000	21,746,000	31,000,000	28,000,000	+ 28,000,000
Total	40,220,000	94,563,000	61,927,000	80,927,000	70,927,000	+ 30,707,000
Economic Development Administration						
Economic dev. assistance programs (inc. H.R. 2887 Supp)	417,000,000	223,150,000		242,842,000	322,842,000	-84,356,000
Defense Economic Adjustment Community Assistance				80,000,000		
Salaries and expenses	28,243,000	30,151,000	28,284,000	30,151,000	28,000,000	+ 1,757,000
Administrative expenses	875,000					-875,000
Total	444,118,000	253,301,000	28,284,000	352,793,000	350,842,000	-83,476,000
Total, Department of Commerce	3,287,187,000	3,576,938,000	2,787,008,000	3,872,826,000	3,836,714,000	+ 348,927,000
(By transfer)	(58,000,000)	(91,400,000)	(25,544,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,800,000)	(-200,000)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of justices	1,801,000	1,841,000	1,816,000	1,816,000	1,816,000	+ 15,000
Other salaries and expenses	20,885,000	22,804,000	20,710,000	21,801,000	21,364,000	+ 889,000
Total	22,286,000	24,575,000	22,326,000	23,217,000	23,000,000	+ 714,000
Case of the building and grounds	3,320,000	3,120,000	2,866,000	2,983,000	2,850,000	-470,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	25,606,000	27,695,000	25,025,000	26,200,000	25,850,000	+ 244,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,714,000	1,755,000	1,727,000	1,727,000	1,727,000	+ 13,000
Other salaries and expenses	9,840,000	13,357,000	11,400,000	10,468,000	11,173,000	+ 1,333,000
Total	11,554,000	15,112,000	13,127,000	12,195,000	12,900,000	+ 1,346,000
United States Court of International Trade						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,307,000	1,358,000	1,331,000	1,331,000	1,331,000	+ 24,000
Other salaries and expenses	9,038,000	10,904,000	9,766,000	9,387,000	9,669,000	+ 631,000
Total	10,345,000	12,262,000	11,100,000	10,718,000	11,000,000	+ 655,000
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	185,777,000	174,921,000	172,131,000	172,131,000	172,131,000	+ 6,354,000
Other salaries and expenses	1,813,223,000	2,252,518,000	2,017,000,000	1,898,269,000	1,863,868,000	+ 170,846,000
Offsetting fee collections					(12,800,000)	(- 12,800,000)
Total budget authority available	(1,979,000,000)	(2,427,440,000)	(2,189,131,000)	(2,070,400,000)	(2,168,800,000)	(- 189,800,000)
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,075,000	2,172,000	2,063,000	2,075,000	2,160,000	+ 85,000
Defender services (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	270,121,000	387,268,000	297,252,000	266,170,000	280,000,000	+ 9,878,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners (inc. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	74,320,000	79,095,000	77,085,000	77,085,000	77,085,000	+ 2,775,000
Court security	81,253,000	105,985,000	84,500,000	80,952,000	88,000,000	+ 4,747,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	2,408,768,000	3,001,940,000	2,650,041,000	2,516,692,000	2,601,255,000	+ 164,486,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts						
Salaries and expenses	45,100,000	57,553,000	44,612,000	43,358,000	44,800,000	-200,000
Federal Judicial Center						
Salaries and expenses	17,500,000	20,453,000	18,467,000	18,296,000	18,450,000	+ 950,000
Judicial Retirement Funds						
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	8,520,000	20,545,000	20,545,000	20,545,000	20,545,000	+ 12,025,000
National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal						
Salaries and expenses	444,000					-443,000
United States Sentencing Commission						
Salaries and expenses	9,000,000	9,000,000	8,468,000	8,474,000	8,468,000	-532,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary	2,534,837,000	3,164,580,000	2,791,385,000	2,656,478,000	2,743,398,000	+ 208,531,000

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
Bill (H.R. 2519) - Continued**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES						
Department of Transportation						
Maritime Administration						
Operating-differential suballottees (liquidation of contract authority)	(225,000,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(+ 15,870,000)
Operations and training	71,736,000	80,081,000	78,423,000	78,423,000	78,423,000	+ 4,867,000
Ready reserve force: Maintenance, Operations, and facilities	240,500,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	138,000,000	138,000,000	-102,500,000
Fleet addition	200,000,000	180,000,000	180,000,000	180,000,000	180,000,000	-40,000,000
Total, Ready reserve force	440,500,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	298,000,000	298,000,000	-142,500,000
Military useful vessel obligation guarantees:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy	48,000,000					-48,000,000
Administrative expenses	4,000,000					-4,000,000
Total, Military useful vessel obligation guarantees	52,000,000					-52,000,000
Total, Maritime Administration	564,236,000	380,081,000	378,423,000	374,423,000	374,423,000	-189,813,000
Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission						
Salaries and expenses	200,000					-200,000
Commission on Agricultural Workers						
Salaries and expenses	578,000					-578,000
Commission on Immigration Reform						
Salaries and expenses	300,000	1,452,000	900,000	500,000	618,000	+ 318,000
(By transfer)					(500,000)	(+ 500,000)
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe						
Salaries and expenses	1,102,000	1,089,000	1,047,000	1,099,000	1,099,000	-3,000
Competitiveness Policy Council						
Salaries and expenses	1,223,000	1,200,000	1,140,000	1,140,000	1,140,000	-83,000
Marine Mammal Commission						
Salaries and expenses	1,260,000	1,200,000	1,226,000	1,290,000	1,290,000	+ 30,000
Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission						
Salaries and expenses	300,000	302,000	300,000	500,000	500,000	+ 200,000
Office of the United States Trade Representative						
Salaries and expenses (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	20,492,000	20,143,000	21,318,000	20,143,000	20,800,000	+ 108,000
Small Business Administration						
Salaries and expenses	248,800,000	227,484,000	243,326,000	215,000,000	258,900,000	+ 12,100,000
Office of Inspector General	8,300,000	9,454,000	7,962,000	7,962,000	7,962,000	-338,000
Business Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	20,479,000	21,032,000	22,994,000	21,032,000	18,946,000	-3,533,000
Guaranteed loans subsidy (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	368,920,000	191,955,000	219,459,000	191,955,000	196,041,000	-192,879,000
Administrative expenses (incl. H.R. 2667 Supp.)	107,101,000	99,723,000	94,737,000	94,737,000	94,737,000	-12,364,000
Total	516,500,000	312,710,000	337,190,000	307,724,000	307,724,000	-208,776,000
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy (incl. H.R. 2118 & 2667 Supp.)	80,000,000	49,825,000	75,000,000	65,000,000		-60,000,000
Administrative expenses	78,000,000	80,106,000	78,101,000	78,101,000	78,101,000	-1,899,000
Subtotal	138,000,000	130,031,000	151,101,000	141,101,000	78,101,000	-61,899,000
Contingency fund (incl. H.R. 2667 Supp.)	(95,000,000)			(75,000,000)	(140,000,000)	(+ 45,000,000)
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	13,020,000	13,372,000	12,399,000	12,399,000	7,000,000	-6,020,000
Total, Small Business Administration	922,620,000	683,081,000	751,948,000	664,156,000	657,687,000	-264,933,000
Thomas Jefferson Commemoration Commission						
Salaries and expenses (incl. H.R. 2118 Supp.)	100,000	200,000	62,000		62,000	-38,000
Legal Services Corporation						
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation 2/	357,300,000	525,515,000		349,000,000	400,000,000	+ 42,700,000
Total, Related agencies	1,869,711,000	1,824,343,000	1,154,364,000	1,432,251,000	1,457,419,000	-412,282,000
(Limitation on direct loans)						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)						
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(225,000,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(+ 15,870,000)

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
Bill (H.R. 2519) - Continued**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE V - DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and Consular Programs 3/.....		1,667,584,000	1,612,206,000	1,653,184,000	1,704,589,000	+ 1,704,589,000
Salaries and expenses 3/.....	2,134,000,000	506,416,000	481,416,000	455,816,000	398,722,000	- 1,737,278,000
Registration fees.....	700,000	700,000	685,000	665,000	665,000	-35,000
Total.....	2,134,700,000	2,174,700,000	2,094,287,000	2,109,665,000	2,101,879,000	-32,724,000
Buying power maintenance.....	14,000,000	4,000,000	3,800,000	3,000,000		-14,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	24,055,000	24,055,000	23,468,000	23,468,000	23,468,000	-586,000
Representation allowances.....	4,800,000	4,881,000	4,780,000	4,780,000	4,780,000	-120,000
Protection of foreign missions and officials.....	10,814,000	10,814,000	10,551,000	10,551,000	10,551,000	-263,000
Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad.....	570,500,000	420,500,000	381,481,000	410,000,000	410,000,000	-160,500,000
New Diplomatic posts.....	25,000,000					-25,000,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.....	6,000,000	8,000,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	-195,000
Repatriation loans program account:						
Direct loans subsidy.....	624,000	624,000	186,000	583,000	583,000	-31,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(780,000)	(780,000)				(-780,000)
Administrative expenses.....	163,000	163,000		183,000	183,000	-10,000
Total.....	817,000	817,000	186,000	778,000	778,000	-41,000
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan.....	15,543,000	15,484,000	15,165,000	15,165,000	15,165,000	-378,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	119,082,000	125,084,000	125,084,000	125,084,000	125,084,000	+ 6,002,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	2,927,411,000	2,788,335,000	-2,868,808,000	2,710,295,000	2,689,808,000	-227,805,000
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions to international organizations.....	820,495,000	860,885,000		860,885,000	860,885,000	+ 40,390,000
Arrears payments.....	92,719,000	97,719,000		44,041,000		-62,719,000
Arrears payments, advance appropriation, FY 1995.....		163,016,000				
Total.....	913,214,000	1,121,620,000		904,926,000	860,885,000	-52,229,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities.....	438,323,000	597,744,000	401,607,000	422,744,000	401,607,000	-36,716,000
Arrears payments.....	21,992,000	21,992,000	20,882,000	21,992,000		-21,992,000
Arrears payments, advance appropriation, FY 1995.....		21,992,000				
Total.....	460,315,000	641,728,000	422,489,000	444,736,000	401,607,000	-58,708,000
International conferences and contingencies.....	5,600,000	6,600,000	5,463,000	6,600,000	6,000,000	+ 400,000
Total, International Organizations and Conferences.....	1,379,129,000	1,769,948,000	427,962,000	1,356,262,000	1,268,492,000	-110,637,000
International Commissions						
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses.....	11,330,000	11,330,000	11,054,000	11,330,000	11,200,000	-130,000
Construction.....	14,790,000	14,790,000	14,051,000	14,790,000	14,400,000	-390,000
American sections, international commissions.....	4,403,000	4,403,000	4,290,300	4,290,000	4,290,000	-113,000
International fisheries commissions.....	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	18,200,000	16,200,000	+ 2,000,000
Total.....	44,723,000	44,723,000	43,595,000	48,610,000	46,090,000	+ 1,367,000
Other						
United States Bilateral Science and Technology Agreements.....	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,275,000	4,275,000	4,275,000	-225,000
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	16,693,000	16,693,000	16,267,000	15,000,000	16,000,000	-693,000
Russian, Eurasian, and East European research and training program.....	4,961,000					-4,961,000
Total.....	26,154,000	21,193,000	20,562,000	19,275,000	20,275,000	-5,879,000
Total, Department of State.....	4,377,417,000	4,824,196,000	3,158,727,000	4,134,442,000	4,034,463,000	-342,954,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
Arms control and disarmament activities.....	46,500,000	62,500,000	47,279,000	56,000,000	53,500,000	+ 7,000,000
Board for International Broadcasting						
Grants and expenses.....	220,000,000	220,000,000		208,000,000	210,000,000	-10,000,000
Israel Relay Station (recession) & (H.R. 2118 Rec.).....	-180,000,000		-180,000,000			+ 180,000,000
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad						
Salaries and expenses.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	

**Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, FY 1994 Appropriations
Bill (H.R. 2519) - Continued**

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	44,852,000	45,416,000	44,391,000	42,000,000	43,500,000	-1,352,000
Japan - United States Friendship Commission						
Japan - United States Friendship Trust Fund	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
(Foreign currency appropriation)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)
United States Information Agency						
Salaries and expenses	736,693,000	773,024,000	730,000,000	741,693,000	730,000,000	-6,693,000
Office of Inspector General	4,390,000	4,360,000	4,247,000	4,247,000	4,247,000	-143,000
Educational and cultural exchange programs	223,447,000	242,922,000	217,650,000	250,702,000	242,000,000	+18,553,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Israel Arab scholarship program	397,000	159,000	159,000	159,000	159,000	-238,000
Radio construction	103,647,000	103,620,000	75,184,000	57,820,000	75,184,000	-28,483,000
Broadcasting to Cuba	28,531,000	28,351,000	28,351,000	21,000,000	-7,531,000
East-West Center	26,000,000	26,000,000	23,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Russian Far East technical assistance center	2,000,000	-2,000,000
North/South Center	8,700,000	8,000,000	8,700,000
National Endowment for Democracy	30,000,000	50,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	+5,000,000
Total	1,164,105,000	1,226,766,000	1,058,320,000	1,144,072,000	1,142,570,000	-21,535,000
Total, related agencies	1,266,907,000	1,556,132,000	971,640,000	1,451,522,000	1,451,020,000	+154,113,000
Total, title V, Department of State and related agencies	5,674,324,000	6,182,331,000	4,130,367,000	5,585,964,000	5,485,483,000	-186,841,000
Grand total	23,616,242,000	24,928,085,000	20,839,956,000	23,540,484,000	23,396,781,000	-219,461,000
Fiscal year 1994	(23,616,242,000)	(24,743,077,000)	(20,839,956,000)	(23,540,484,000)	(23,396,781,000)	(-219,461,000)
Fiscal year 1995	(185,006,000)
(By transfer)	(55,000,000)	(61,400,000)	(55,544,000)	(54,000,000)	(55,300,000)	(+300,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,181,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,100,000)	(3,395,000)	(3,395,000)	(+214,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(780,000)	(780,000)	(-780,000)
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(225,000,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(240,870,000)	(+15,870,000)
(Foreign currency appropriation)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)

1/ The State Justice Institute is authorized to submit its budget directly to Congress. The President's budget proposes elimination of the Institute.

2/ The Legal Services Corporation is authorized to submit its budget request directly to Congress. The President's budget includes \$432,000,000 for the Corporation. Includes H.R. 2667 Supp. H.R. 2667 Supp.

3/ The President's budget included this request in a combined Salaries and expenses account which totaled \$2,174,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a number of questions have been raised on the intent of the conferees regarding the appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency educational and cultural exchange programs account.

The House proposed an appropriation of \$217,650,000 for this USIA appropriation account and provided 95 percent of adjusted current services for programs. The House allowance also assumed that Freedom Support Act exchange programs that had been previously funded by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act should continue to be funded by that act. The House report did not provide a table detailing recommended funding levels for each program.

The Senate version of H.R. 2519 provided \$250,702,000 for the educational and cultural exchange programs account and Senate Report 103-105 on pages 115 and 116 provided a table that provides recommended funding levels by exchange program. The Senate also concurred with the House and deleted funding requested by the administration for Freedom Support Act exchanges. Finally, and most importantly, the Senate recommended that \$19,255,000 in exchange support costs be supported from within funds provided for the educational and cultural exchange program account.

The conferees agreed to provide \$242,000,000 for the educational and cultural exchange programs account, but did not provide a table detailing recommendations by exchange program. The conferees did, however, note that increases should be provided for the following programs; the International Visitor Program, the Fulbright and other academic programs—to include Vietnamese student exchanges and CAMPUS—the Claude and Mildred Pepper Scholarship Program, various new exchange programs—to include the Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program and exchanges for Pacific Island nations in the Western and South Pacific, if authorized—the American Studies Program—if authorized, and the Humphrey Fellowship. This approach was taken because the House felt that we should provide flexibility to the Director of USIA in the funding levels for various exchanges, and that the USIA should submit a reprogramming proposal to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Statement of Managers inadvertently omitted to mention that the conferees had also agreed to include exchange support costs within the educational and cultural exchange programs appropriation account. It is my belief that the reprogramming that USIA sends to us should include at least \$13 million for exchange support costs.

I hope that this statement clears up any confusion regarding the conferees' intent.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman made the point. I think we have to assist countries like Albania, but can the Members tell me anything that disallows the State Department of the United States to enter into a contract with an agency such as the Endowment for Democracy that could not provide funds for countries like Albania? Why does this have to be a direct earmarked amount of money that has been unac-

countable to the Congress or to the President or to the State Department?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is not unaccountable, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If it is accountable, does the chairman of the subcommittee know all the consultants? Does the chairman know all the people that have used money to travel including Members of the House and Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will continue to yield, in the first 2 years when the NED set up there were some abuses. I do not think they have had those abuses since. In the first 2 years they could not make the grants because there were not institutions that could take the funds and use them wisely. The NED made the grants too fast, but that is not going on now.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I would ask the gentleman, is there any reason why the same activities carried on in Albania could not be carried on through contract arrangements with the State Department, and without a direct earmark to the Endowment for Democracy?

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the committee position on the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Kanjorski amendment, which would insist on the House position eliminating funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

I oppose the Kanjorski amendment because the Endowment and its four core grantees—the National Democratic Institute, the International Republican Institute, the Center for International Private Enterprise and the Free Trade Union Institute—provide the best kind of aid the United States can provide. They export democracy.

I know. I have seen the Endowment's work.

In April, as a member of the Appropriation Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I participated in the leadership's study mission to Russia and Ukraine. When our delegation arrived in Kiev, in Ukraine, we were met by Sarah Farnsworth, who heads a two-person National Democratic Institute team in Kiev.

Sarah, a young political organizer from the United States, told us that her job in Ukraine is to teach Ukrainians how to run a modern democracy. She advises political parties and local officials. She works with city councils and with the Ukrainian parliament.

And every Ukrainian we talked to told us how important her work is. After all, Ukraine is a new democracy and after decades under the Soviet boot, Ukrainians need American know-how to help them make democracy work.

Sarah's work is typical of programs the National Endowment for Democracy Funds throughout the world.

In Cambodia, the National Democrat and Republican Institutes worked to organize the first democratic elections ever held in that country. Young Americans spent a year living in Cambodia, risking their lives to give the people of that country a chance for peace and democracy after decades of war and genocide.

In Russia, the National Democratic Institute is working with Russian television, civic organizations, and political parties to promote voter education and participation in the election scheduled for December. Recent events in Russia demonstrate just how essential such United States-Russian cooperation is if real democracy is to take hold.

In South Africa, the National Democratic and Republican Institutes are there helping to organize next April's election which will lead to the establishment of a democratic South Africa and the dismantling of apartheid.

In short, the Endowment and its core grantees, are all over the world helping to create that new world order we talk about so much.

It is inconceivable that we would cut funding for a program that has done so much to build democracy in places that have never known democracy.

The National Endowment for Democracy deserves our support. It is one Government agency that would make Thomas Jefferson proud.

Defeat this amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan, Carter, Ford, and Nixon, and many colleagues in support for \$35 million for the National Endowment for Democracy.

I can personally attest to the importance and effectiveness of NED-funded activities, having participated in a number of programs of the National Democratic Institute [NDI]. NDI is a core grantee of the NED, as is the National Republican Institute [NRI].

In 1988, I served as a member of the bipartisan international observer delegation to the historic presidential plebiscite which led to the defeat of General Pinochet. That delegation was led by Bruce Babbitt and former President Adolfo Suarez of Spain. NDI's program and other NED-funded activities provided timely support to Chile's free elections movement which spearheaded the country's return to democracy after 16 years of brutal dictatorship.

In 1990, I participated in bipartisan political development programs in Hungary and Czechoslovakia in preparation for their first multiparty elections in nearly 50 years. As Vaclav Havel has noted, NDI was one of the first supporting actors in the democratic resolution in the Czech and Slovak Republics and contributed significantly to the country's first free elections.

From my experience, the success of NED-funded programs in these three countries alone would have justified the Endowment's entire worldwide budget. Today, requests for assistance from democratic leaders overseas far outstrip the Endowment's modest resources.

I have witnessed the importance of these highly innovative democratic development programs and believe that they represent a convergence of the moral and strategic interests of the United States. The promotion of democracy and human rights not only reflects the best values of our country, but serves our strategic interests by promoting a more peaceful world.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the motion and support this valuable program.

□ 1410

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a very valued member of our committee.

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the debate today over NED funding is, part of a larger debate that has gained momentum as the cold war recedes into the past, a debate over the direction that America will play in the coming years in promoting its interests overseas.

Will we turn inward or look outward?

History tells us that retreating inward is a shortsighted and ultimately destructive path for our Nation. In an increasingly linked and interdependent world, it is in our national interest that we take every opportunity to project our values outward—to peoples beyond our shores.

We must use tools other than diplomacy or the force of arms to ensure that communism does not reemerge in nations that have only recently shaken its yoke and is buried in the nations where it remains—including China, Cuba, Vietnam, and North Korea. Those tools include VOA and the surrogate radio RFE, RL, RFA, and yes NED. NED is in fact one of the best tools we have to project our Nation's values—human rights, rule of law, democratic institutions and a market oriented economy and it deserves our support.

NED has been criticized for providing grants to labor and business, Republicans and Democrats. From a political standpoint this approach gives everyone something to dislike about the activities of NED. It seems to me, however, that the activities funded by NED accurately reflect the very diversity of our Nation that we are trying to promote in countries whose institutions have been monolithic and centrally controlled for generations. Our goal as a nation—and de Tocqueville would not be surprised to see America promoting

this concept—is to foster a wealth of institutions, both public and private, in emerging democracies. We have done it here at home and these institutions are the backbone of our pluralistic system. It is in our best interests to help other nations develop alternatives to central planning. NED is serving a vital national need that we should be supporting now more than ever. I hope that Members will recognize that cementing the gains we have made during the cold war is essential to our own future prosperity and support the conference report funding for NED.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I oftentimes come to the floor to encourage my colleagues to vote against the space station, to vote against the advanced solid rocket motor, and to try to lead efforts to reform Congress. In the spirit of all three of those things, I encourage my colleagues today to support the reforms that we are making in the National Endowment for Democracy, and we are making those reforms.

There are three reasons why we should support the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] in his efforts. First of all, the world is changing and we must respond to those changes. Who would have imagined 5 years ago that Mr. Mandela and Mr. Je Klerk would be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize? Who would have imagined many of us would have viewed or had an opportunity to see Mr. Arafat and Mr. Rabin shake hands on the White House lawn? We must respond to those efforts of peace in the world.

Second, we need to be proactive. We have spent hours of debate over the few weeks on Haiti and Somalia. Let us be proactive so as not to get into those situations, and the National Endowment for Democracy can help us not become engulfed in those situations.

Finally, we have reformed this program. We have gone down from your vote a few months ago, from \$48 to \$35 million. And we have come up with better auditing and accounting principles to account for money spent in this program.

I encourage my colleagues, with a tough vote, to support the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support for the funding contained in this appropriations conference report for the National Endow-

ment for Democracy. I commend the leadership of the House conferees, specifically the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittees, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the ranking Republican member, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] who serves on our Foreign Affairs Committee for their efforts to continue funding for this important tool of our Nation's foreign policy.

As recent events have dramatized, no single foreign policy challenge facing the United States today in the post-cold war era is of greater importance than helping the former states of the Soviet Union and other countries as they make the transition to democracy. This is a long and difficult process. Many of these countries remain in turmoil and will for years to come. A return to authoritarian order would impose a threat to our national interests and to the prospects for a peaceful world.

That is why it is so important to assist those who are trying to build democracy in the successor States of the Soviet Union, and the other courageous countries who share our values. If they succeed, it will serve American interests. It will mean lower defense costs, more stable trading partners, fewer refugees who must flee tyranny, and a more stable world.

Cementing this stability is one of the best arguments for continuation of the National Endowment for Democracy. It is a cost effective program that seeks to help people organize to meet the challenges of managing and running democratic governments. Establishing democratic institutions is often a matter of breaking new ground and, therefore, requires the kind of reliable support provided by NED. Withdrawing from these commitments, and the programs the organizations and its grantees already have underway would undermine the goals which we all seek.

We are reorienting our priorities in the post-cold-war era. Our Nation's emphasis is one of supporting the transition to democratic governments and to securing our national interests by creating the environment for a politically, and economically stable world. NED is our frontline force to carry out these policies. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to reject any effort to cut funding for the National Endowment for Democracy and agree to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

As the Wall Street Journal editorialized yesterday, October 20, 1993:

It's abundantly obvious that many emerging nations need help in constructing democratic institutions (the U.S. hardly got it right overnight) and a vote to support the Endowment would show that the House recognizes that fact.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the appropriation for the National Endowment for Democracy and ask my colleagues to reverse the House's decision and join me in support of this vital program. This vote will be one that our children and grandchildren will look back upon as one that decided whether the United States would offer support to countries trying to develop democratic systems.

Mr. Speaker, we all rejoiced when Boris Yeltsin was victorious in his confrontation with the Communist-era Supreme Soviet. Yet for that victory to mean anything, the Russian parliamentary elections scheduled for December must be free and fair and elect a parliament committed to reform and democracy. Shouldn't the United States provide some assistance to the pro-democracy candidates and parties? The National Endowment for Democracy is the best—and in many cases the only—way to provide this assistance. Or are we willing to see an election where the neo-Communists, Fascists, and ultra-nationalists have the organizational advantage? It would be a bitter irony indeed, if the forces loyal to Rutskoi and Khasbulatov could win this election because they had a better political machine than the democratic reformers.

The National Endowment for Democracy was developed during the cold war, and played an important role in ending communism. Yet it is still vitally important in consolidating that victory. It is still an open question whether these formerly Communist countries will become democracies or disintegrate into ethnic civil wars. If you would prefer to send trade missions overseas rather than peacekeeping troops, support the NED. It is important.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

□ 1420

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I thank the gentleman from California, [Mr. BERMAN], chairman, of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. SMITH].

I rise in very, very strong support of the committee's action. The \$35 million to further democracy is certainly one of the best investments we will make this year. As you have heard the gentlewoman from California say, every living President, Republican and Democratic, supports NED. Why? Because they have confronted firsthand the challenge of enshrining and furthering democracy around the world, which is in the best interest of every American and it is in the best interest of international stability and security.

This is one, as I said before, of the best investments we will make this year. We ought not to shrink from the world, we ought to engage it.

I would respond to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] when he

implies that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party are somehow special interests—they are indeed in the general interest. The parties have philosophical differences, but something that they have in common with one another is a belief in democracy, in freedom, and in justice. And it is together, because that is our common interest and our common cause.

We go abroad and we encourage those who reach for freedom, who reach for democracy, who reach for the dream that they call American democracy, as Václav Havel said on this floor to a joint session. We reach out to them not in a partisan sense but in an American sense. That is why this program engages both parties.

Then, yes, we have differences. Labor and business have differences, they have different perspectives; but a perspective that they share in common is that democracy leads to the welfare of all of us and leads to the welfare of both labor and of business. That is why I suggest to my friend from Pennsylvania that we have adopted a program that brings together the partisans in this country, business and labor, to say that while we have differences, it is not on the importance of furthering democracy in this globe. I believe that we ought to support this program as strongly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] on his time, as I do not have any time remaining.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National Endowment for Democracy.

This is a program that works and that we need to have continue with its work. It is a program strongly supported by our President and by two former Presidents. It is a program vigorously supported by Presidents of foreign countries who have come to power through democratic means and who are now in need of America's help in building democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that we are witness to an unprecedented era of democratization across the globe and that more people are living more freely than ever before. But the sad truth is that the clear majority of the member States in the United Nations lack even the superficial trappings of the rule of law based on justice. Even in places where progress has apparently been achieved, events in Moscow are a stark reminder of just how very fragile progress may be. Mr. Speaker, to vote against NED would destroy an organization that has actively and constructively furthered democracy worldwide and seriously cripple a major U.S. foreign policy objective to shore up democracies worldwide. The fact is we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on defense and on arming other countries in the name of making the world safe for democracy—how can we now—with the wave of the future surely being one of democracy, not invest \$35 million to solidify our gains and ultimately ensure their success. Why now, at the very moment when we are perched on the threshold of realizing the sacrifices we have made as a Nation and a people in the name of democracy, human rights, and freedom,

would we stop a program specifically mandated to help groups construct and build upon the democratic gains already made. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, NED is needed more now than ever before.

As co-chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I am particularly familiar with NED's work in East-Central Europe and in Russia. Nobody needs to be reminded of the sweeping changes we have seen in those regions—changes that continue to impress and inspire. But while communism seemed to collapse overnight, democracy will take years to secure, and while NED's assistance has directly contributed to the democratic changes that have already taken place in East-Central Europe and in Russia, I want to stress that NED's continuing assistance will be vital to ensure that democracy survives.

Mr. Speaker, how can we seriously speak of denying tools by which to construct their democratic future to those very people and groups who look to the United States and its arsenal of democracy as a beacon of hope—and of what can be. Are we prepared to say to these people that having won the cold war we are no longer interested in ensuring democratic systems and maintaining peace and stability. This is not only short-sighted, it will in the long run undermine all our successes.

Across the former Soviet Union, all but one of the newly independent states has an ex-Communist as its president. Gradually we have seen the restoration of the old elite. This is not good news for the long-term prospects for democracy. Azerbaijan and Armenia remain locked in battle in one of the bloodiest and longest running conflicts in the former Soviet Union. In the past year, thousands in Georgia have been killed and many more have become refugees in the war with Abkhazia. Georgia's defeat several weeks ago and the fall of the Abkhaz capital, to Abkhaz forces aided by Russians and northern Caucasians, have inaugurated a new stage in the multiple crises that have bedeviled this beautiful country. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to read the final chapter on democratization. If we refuse to assist fledgling democracies we will have dictated a better ending to a peace that could have yielded institutions to protect and promote human rights.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a cost-saving mechanism this is it. It is an investment in our future and in America's security. For a small amount today, we can in the long-term save literally billions of dollars. The reason is simple: democracies do not go to war with other democracies, democracies attempt to resolve conflicts in peaceful ways, democracies make valuable trading partners, and democracies honor the rights of its citizens. Today, we are asked to make a small investment in people and programs that can yield extraordinary dividends in years to come if we keep the vision within sight. The real fact is that we cannot afford the failure of those groups, individuals and programs that NED supports. It is in our national interests that democracy be actively promoted abroad.

Just in the past year NED has provided assistance in almost 80 countries—in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. It has supported women's leadership conferences, election monitoring activities, political party training programs, grassroots participation and technical assistance to local

governments, political parties, parliaments, businesses and civic groups. Our support for NED has been a small investment that has already delivered a tremendous return and promises much more.

Mr. Speaker, I understand my colleagues' concern that NED's funds be carefully and comprehensively accounted for and spent wisely. Certainly, we all have a responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are responsibly spent. The fact is that NED has already increased internal auditing to ensure that its resources are used as cost-effectively as possible. Frankly, killing the endowment will send a terrible signal to the numerous democratic organizations that depend on NED for assistance. It will send a terrible signal to the brave individuals around the world who rely on NED's commitment to democracy. It will send a terrible signal to the fledgling democracies at a time when they need our determined support. In short, it will be a terrible mistake.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland in order that I may ask him a question.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if it is so good for democracy that the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO are getting together and spending this money, particularly here in the House, would the gentleman not agree that part of democracy is disclosure? And does the gentleman not think then that it is responsible that the NED and its grantees disclose how many congressional staff and how many Members of the House and Senate travel of these funds but do not make public disclosure to their constituents and to the taxpayers?

Mr. HOYER. I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania that there is no doubt in my mind that the Institutes and that the National Endowment for Democracy will in fact disclose such information as the committees believe appropriate to carry out their oversight responsibilities.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The committee has never asked for it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to respond to the gentleman.

No. 1, I take umbrage, as chairman of the subcommittee with oversight jurisdiction over the National Endowment for Democracy, I take umbrage at the implication that there is no oversight, that this committee does not do its job, that this committee does not have access to any piece of information that it wants from either the National Endowment for Democracy or any of its core grantees. The fact is there is oversight, there is a description of every single program, there is a description of exactly how these core grantees do business. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants a specific piece of information, then the gentleman can inquire.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Endowment for Democracy. Some around here have talked about the need to bring about this \$35 million cut in the name of deficit reduction. Well, quite frankly, the idea of believing that you can cut NED in the name of deficit reduction is about as smart as a weight-loss program that advocates losing 10 pounds by cutting off your arm. Killing NED is something best proposed during "Be Kind to Dictators Week." If NED dies, there will be applause the world over. Unfortunately, it will resonate from the headquarters of every military strong-man, antidemocratic warlord, Communist apparatchik and local meeting of Future Dictators Anonymous.

On the other hand, if NED goes forward, there will also be cheers. Mr. Speaker, in this case, they will be led by the captains of groups and parties who are on the front lines of democracy-building in places as far away as China, Russia, Southern Africa, Southeast Asia, and central Europe.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to claim victory, to claim to support to democracy when you sit behind a very comfortable desk here in Washington, DC. On the other hand, it is tough to fight for those principles in the face of police states, fascist thugs and Communist dictators. When you fight for democracy in places like China, Cambodia, and Tibet, you put your life on the line.

Fang Lizhi, known as China's Sakharov, has done just that, and he strongly supports National Endowment for Democracy funding. It is very much the same thing throughout Central and Eastern Europe. Communism has large collapsed, but democracy has not yet won. Just as the cold war was a 45-year, twilight struggle between good and evil, the ultimate victory of democracy, human rights, and human dignity will not be achieved in a year or two. That is why Vytautas Landsbergis and Elena Bonner strongly support the NED. There is no longer one major battle between democracy and dictatorship personified by the United States and the Soviet Union. Instead, democracy and dictatorship are engaged in 100 guerrilla wars around the world. We cannot fight those wars. As we learned in Somalia and Bosnia, United States troops cannot maintain peace and freedom everywhere. But we can provide some meager assistance to those who are on the front lines in those fights. We do not help them because it is nice, we do not send tax dollars overseas because of feel-good humanitarian reasons; we do it because it is in our rock-solid na-

tional interest that democracy prevail in those struggles.

I urge support for the National Endowment for Democracy. We have to move ahead and give these people an opportunity to enjoy the same political pluralism which we enjoy in the United States.

Faced by this crisis, how many of us asked ourselves what we could do to help ensure a peaceful transition to democracy in Russia? We know how important it is, but what can we do? Many of us don't think billions more economic aid is the answer. We all know that the United States could never intervene militarily in Russia. What can we do other than watch CNN?

Mr. Speaker, I contend that supporting NED, supporting the motion of the Chairman, is the single concrete thing that we can do. If you want to help bring about the eventual victory of democracy in Russia, it's that simple. By the way, it's also the best thing we can do to help bring democracy to places like China, Cuba, and Vietnam, and to lock in gains in Eastern Europe and Central America. NED, created with bipartisan support by Ronald Reagan, still promotes our national interests and national security, and it still deserves our strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose a letter from former President Ronald Reagan:

JULY 4, 1993.

FRANK J. FAHRENKOPF, Jr., Esq.,
Hogan & Hartson, Columbia Square, Washington, DC.

DEAR FRANK: On this 217th anniversary of our nation's independence, I am reminded that America's greatness lies not only in our success at home, but in the example of leadership that we provide the entire world. It is a testament to our nation's ideals that America's democratic political system continues to be a source of inspiration and admiration throughout the globe. And it is a credit to our work together that our democratic ideals actually have begun to prevail.

Our work, however, is not complete. As I look abroad, I see that the struggle between freedom and tyranny continues to be waged. Disappointingly, in some places, it is autocracy, not freedom, that is winning the day.

This is why I strongly support continued Congressional funding for the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). Ten years ago, at Westminster, you will recall that I outlined a new, bold initiative for our country to publicly lead the struggle for freedom abroad. As part of this effort, at my request, the National Endowment for Democracy was created.

In its short life, NED has been on the cutting edge of America's work to strengthen new democracies and to open closed societies to democratic ideas. During my time in Washington, and even since returning to California, I have seen firsthand that, from Moscow to Managua, NED's work has opened the dream of freedom to millions. This, in turn, has advanced the American interest in peace and freedom, making the world safer for our children.

Yet, these new democracies are still fragile, and over half of the world still remains in the hands of tyrants. From Havana to Hanoi, much work remains to be done. Clearly, now is not the time for us to abandon the courageous men and women who continue our fight for freedom and look to us for inspiration and support. Without the strong

and energetic support of NED, however, it is unlikely that these struggling democracies can prevail. And should they fail, we run the risk of reversing the great global strides that we made together. This could potentially jeopardize our own very freedom.

I urge now, as I did ten years ago, for continued support of NED to ensure that America remains that shining city on the hill.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from California, Mr. BERMAN, indicate that he has held hearings. To my knowledge, NED's funding has increased from \$17 million in 1990 to now a proposed \$35 million. It was only in 1991 that hearings were held. No hearings have been held since that time.

So the two largest increases were held without hearings.

What I would like to say to the gentleman from California, Mr. BERMAN, is if he has held all these hearings and if he has information that we do not have, could we get an agreement from him on the record today that he will request a complete list from the Republican Institute, the Democratic Institute, the AFL-CIO, and the Chamber of Commerce of all individuals who received any finances for any trips anywhere in the world that used any of these funds? Can we have those for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on his time?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman commits to disclosing any aspect of information the gentleman wants except insofar as the safety of individuals in totalitarian countries working on democracy programs might be jeopardized.

Mr. KANJORSKI. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman will provide a list of every Member of the House and the Senate and any member of the staff of these bodies that has ever traveled on any of the funds since the inception in 1985.

Mr. BERMAN. The chairman commits to providing that list. The gentleman could get it right now from every disclosure form, from every Member of Congress and from every staff person that is part of the required disclosure.

□ 1430

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over. We have heard that 20 times a day ad nauseum, but the struggle for democracy is not over. The struggle for de-

mocracy and justice and peace around the world goes on all over the globe from Managua to Manila, from the Baltics to South Africa.

Now, the U.S. Government cannot do it all. We cannot get into every place; we cannot obtain the confidence of all the people that we would like to have, but private enterprise, organized labor, they can do that.

Is it not marvelous, there is no gridlock between Democrats, Republicans, management and labor, on the topic of building democracy? This is a task that is never won. It goes on and on, and this institute, which is independent of the Government but funded by the Government, is uniquely constituted to answer requests from organizations and labor unions, like Solidarity, to help them with printing presses, with publications, with communications. It is invaluable.

If there are mistakes, if they have not got the accounting that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] would like, it can be gotten for them. These are honest people, doing indispensable work in the struggle for democracy.

The National Endowment for Democracy [NED] grew from an idea by Ronald Reagan in 1983 as a creative effort to foster democracy throughout the world.

The Reagan-Bush years saw dozens of authoritarian and Communist regimes crumble under the weight of their discredited political and economic systems, culminating in the collapse of the Soviet Union. Millions of people across the globe are suddenly at a crossroads. Will they construct governments that protect basic human rights and respond to the will of the people? Will they establish free market economies that will thrive and provide huge markets for international trade? Or will their societies be swept backward into the abyss of totalitarian tyranny that will threaten our national interests?

The Soviet bear is comatose, but with 30,000 nuclear weapons aimed at us, it's hard to say that bear is dead. But the forest is full of snakes—the poisonous snakes of ethnic and religious hatreds, and their bite is deadly for peace, justice, and freedom.

NED is active in almost 100 countries working through some 75 grant recipients to help emerging democracies develop the building blocks to firmly establish stable democratic systems from the Baltic to South Africa, from Manila to Managua. Through its grant recipients, including the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, the AFL-CIO, and chamber of commerce, NED helps to formulate election laws, train poll workers, and teach activists to build political parties—the nitty gritty of building democracy.

NED is an affirmation of the vision of President Reagan and a wise investment in the future of freedom. It is a prudent—and relatively modest—expenditure to protect our national security.

Please note that we spare no expense in funding the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts. They receive an appropriation that is at least 10 times what NED will receive in this bill. Which do you think is the more important investment?

I plead with my colleagues to support funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. It is bipartisan, cost-effective, and immensely important in the difficult task of democracy building in a world that, with the cold war over, is not less dangerous—only differently dangerous.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER, of California. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would reject the funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. I do not think there are many of us who disagree, or any of us who disagree with the goals, the promotion, and the establishment of democracy to help other countries.

I just do not know why these organizations need Federal moneys to do this. These organizations all have large memberships, have rich treasuries, they use money for every purpose under the Sun. If they want to engage in this with their counter organizations in other countries, or fledgling organizations in other countries within the trade movement and the business communities or others, they ought to be able to do that.

I just do not think when we are looking at the budget priorities of this country that this is where we ought to be putting Federal dollars.

I think it is very clear that these organizations are capable of engaging in this. There is private money available for sending people on these trips that have the wherewithal, if this is their gift to the country, they have the wherewithal to provide for their own travel, to provide for their stays, and they can engage in this as private citizens of the United States.

This idea grew in the cold war. It has had many uses. It has been manipulated a number of different ways.

The fact is, it was not a good idea then, and it is not a good idea now. It is simply a bad use of the very limited Federal dollars that our taxpayers send us to be used in the priorities of this country. This ought not to be one of them.

We ought to encourage these organizations, the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, to continue this effort. I do not think we need Federal involvement in that issue.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], the chairman of the freshmen Democratic class.

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier, when this program was brought to the House floor, I voted against it. I was not persuaded that it was needed, and that it was limited in its scope of service. Some critics said because the program supported grassroot organization it was ineffective. In the wake of the cold war, we are learning that the world remains a troubled and turbulent place. At the same time, the United States plays a significant role in

spreading the benefits of democracy and market reform throughout the world.

Recently, we have seen the problems associated with involving our military in localized political conflicts. We have heard the public outcry that our Armed Forces should not be used for the purposes of state building. We have visually witnessed the difficulty of deploying our troops on foreign soil.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support for the National Endowment for Democracy because it represents the kind of preventative medicine needed to reduce the likelihood of future political crises in developing democracies. The National Endowment for Democracy is involved in funding grassroots level projects assisting countries in developing democratic political parties, monitoring elections, enhancing international private-sector initiatives, and strengthening indigenous labor unions in order to improve working standards. The National Endowment for Democracy is involved throughout the African continent—from Zaire to Kenya to South Africa—in fostering democratic foundations.

Mr. Speaker, let us put our money where our mouth is. Let us fund the National Endowment for Democracy, because it works in building democracy in developing countries. I urge my colleagues to defeat the motion to restrict funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Endowment for Democracy.

As a person who has been, and is still, pursuing democracy in Central America, I would like to take this opportunity to express my public support for the National Endowment for Democracy [NED]. Through NED I have helped assure honest elections in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala and I hope, developed democracy there, often with my own money.

In my opinion, the NED has played an important role in supporting the democratic cause all around the world. The pro-democracy movements of many countries are directly encouraged by NED's efforts. It is true that the cold war is over, but it does not mean that democracy has been achieved. In fact, many countries today are still ruled by dictators, still lack freedom of speech, still have no meaningful elections, and still hold political prisoners. Therefore, NED's functions are still absolutely necessary for the leadership of the United States in the international arena.

Recently, I signed a "Dear Colleague" offered by Congressmen HAMILTON and GILMAN urging Member's to support the conferee's position regarding funding for the NED in the Com-

merce, State, Justice conference report. As the "Dear Colleague" stated, NED is a critical element in America's political strategy. While NED is only part of a larger strategy to support democracy, it plays a pivotal role as a private entity in mobilizing the dynamics of America's private sector, our two political parties, and numerous other private groups.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for NED.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the National Endowment for Democracy is reviewed by four congressional committees. It is reviewed by a CPA firm every year. Every single one of its grants is in its annual report. It is subject to the Freedom of Information Act, every OMB regulation; but most importantly, this is the kind of program that my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, ought to be behind, because it is result-oriented rather than process-oriented, which is the case with too many Federal grants.

But the State Department cannot go funding the National Republican Committee, or the Democratic Committee, or the AFL-CIO, or the Chamber of Commerce, and yet they are the essence of how our democracy works.

The State Department is not going to be funding leaflets that they distributed in the August 1991, coup to the Soviet troops, but yet, that was important.

We do not have the kind of flexibility to accomplish that. We cannot get involved in the kind of solidarity movement efforts that the National Endowment for Democracy did.

Look at the testimonials from the Solidarity people in Poland and what a difference they made.

Go through the list of all the people that we respect so much, the Dalai Lama, Fang Lizhi of China, and Mrs. Bonner.

□ 1440

Every single one of them, Mr. Speaker, say the National Endowment for Democracy is creating an enormous difference all over the world. That is what the United States is all about. That is what our Federal programs ought to be all about. We have got to keep this program. There is a substantial reduction from what the House wanted. There is a substantial reduction, even more substantial, from what the administration wanted.

Mr. Speaker, this is money well spent, a lot better spent than most of the money funded by the Federal programs that we consistently approve day after day in this House.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, as one who had opposed the funding for NED before rising today in strong support of this, I say, "You cannot have seen the shooting in Moscow and the rioting in the streets without realizing that the National Endowment for Democracy is our best national security tool."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOPE].

(Mr. INHOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INHOPE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard over and over today, the recent events in Haiti and Somalia have created a great deal of concern in the Congress and among our constituents. I am constantly asked why the United States is sending American troops to areas of the world where there is no vital national security interest at stake. I answer this question, "We should not send our troops under these conditions and should bring our troops home." Our current operation in Somalia has cost over a billion dollars and more importantly taken the lives of 30 of this Nation's finest soldiers. This is a difficult issue, but there are certain basic lessons that appear self-evident, and all point in the direction of using other avenues to the promotion of democracy abroad. More specifically, we must support efforts such as the National Endowment for Democracy. It is far more cost effective and humanitarian to our own citizens to reserve our troops for national security purposes and look to the National Endowment for Democracy to support democracy.

I think there are four lessons here, Mr. Speaker:

The first lesson is one cannot impose democracy. It has to grow from within a society. The most that can be done from the outside is to provide some help, like watering a plant. And that is what the National Endowment for Democracy does. It provides modest financial assistance to grassroots democratic groups, as well as training and education in the tools of democracy. It believes that you cannot do for others what they cannot do for themselves, but that you should provide a helping hand. That is not a bad principle.

The second lesson—democracy is much more than elections. It only works if there is a strong civil society and market economy that is working every day of the year, not just when people go to vote. One of the most attractive features of the National Endowment for Democracy is the fact that it recognizes that democracy is a whole system of institutions that protects individual rights and that makes freedom work for the people.

The third lesson—democracy doesn't come quickly. It didn't come quickly

in our own country, and it certainly won't come quickly in poor countries that lack a democratic tradition. Therefore we have to be ready to help over the long term—to stay with democratic movements in good times and bad. The United States is not a fair weather friend of democracy. That is why we need an organization like the National Endowment for Democracy which has the commitment, the staying power and the experience to work democracy over time so that we will not wait until a crisis occurs and then use that crisis to justify sending in our troops.

The fourth and final lesson—the United States will not stay with an undertaking of this kind if the cost is too high. We have our own problems. The budget deficit being one of the most important. We, therefore, need to find cost-effective ways to assist democracy. That, too, points in the direction of the National Endowment for Democracy because it works at the grassroots level, with highly efficient, nonbureaucratic private organizations. I would have preferred to continue funding at last year's National Endowment for Democracy budget level of \$30 million. At this time, we just do not have the latitude to change the funding level. But, we should keep in mind the global nature of the endowment's mission, which includes programs in Asia, Africa, Latin America, the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East. It would seem that this is a relatively inexpensive way to carry out a far-reaching public function and far cheaper than dropping a billion dollars in troop support in areas where our national security is not impaired.

As a conservative, Mr. Speaker, I say to those who are offended, as I am, that the President is still sending our troops to remote areas with no defined mission. There is an alternative, and I urge my colleagues to support the most cost-effective alternative, the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we all here are concerned about the deficit, and it is also clear that we have to begin to tighten our belts whether it is the Congress or any other Federal agency.

Mr. Speaker, this week I would have liked to have voted to support the super collider, but I could not. I could not with a \$250 billion deficit. I would have liked to have supported the space station as well, but I could not, not with a \$250 billion deficit. And I would have preferred not to close down military bases across the country, but we had to especially with a \$250 billion deficit. NED is the same way.

I will remind all of my colleagues that we voted to kill this agency by a lopsided margin earlier this summer,

and somehow it comes back to the floor with a 17½-percent increase from last year. No wonder the rest of the country outside the Beltway thinks that we are a bunch of loonies. We have got a deficit, and we have got to begin to make some tough choices, and frankly sending private citizens on a red carpet travel service, often first class, so that they can see the rest of the world is something that I cannot justify. I cannot justify this with so many other unfunded Federal mandates.

Let us not stick the taxpayers with these junkets, with another \$35 million. Let us make NED stand for "not enough dough" because we simply do not have it, not with a \$250 billion deficit. This is real money, funded from private resources, not the public trough.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate and feeling a little guilty. On June 22 this great House by a vote of 247 to 171 chose not to fund NED. I was directly involved in this effort with the Kanjorski-Shays amendment. When I started reading all the criticism of his amendment, I was grateful I wasn't getting much credit for it.

Note I said his amendment. I was truly grateful my name was not associated with it. Great Americans editorial boards and others have spoken in favor of NED and have criticized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] for his efforts. I was happy not to be criticized. But I just have to say to my colleagues, "Mr. Kanjorski is a very brave man. He is so right on this issue. And, while everyone speaks differently, he has focused on the main issue that everyone seems to ignore."

It is clear the cold war has ended, and it is also clear the world is not a safer place. We acknowledge that. We need to help fledgling democracies, and we acknowledge that. What we do not acknowledge is that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that the AFL-CIO, that the Republican Party or the Democrat Party should be given \$35 million to spend taxpayer's money as they see fit.

Now I know they have institutes that are somewhat separate from their organizations, but, when we hear from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for instance, it sends us information about the Center for International Private Enterprise under its own masthead. The literature says the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and then it tells about the institute, as if it were an integral part of the chamber. The chamber gives us a lot of promotional material and no documentation on how it spends our money.

I do not know how many Members of this Congress have gone on trips, and I would not be able to find out. I do not know how many fundraisers for the Democrat or Republican Parties go on

trips, and I would not be able to find out.

Mr. Speaker, I hear comments that we can find answers to our questions but, when we seek to find them, they are not available.

I am troubled the committee has not had hearings on NED in recent years. I am also troubled by the fact that, GAO reports of 1986 and 1991, strongly criticize how NED does what it does. And I'm further troubled when I read a 1992 GAO report that says it's too soon to find out if NED has made the necessary reforms. Too soon?

A few years ago NED was a \$15 million program, now it is a \$35 million program. It has gone up 17 percent at the same time we are cutting so many other programs.

But what troubles me the most is what we cannot even talk about, the stories we hear that we cannot document. I remember something that happened when I was in the general assembly in Connecticut. A young legislator took a political position on an important issue that the Republican Party leadership in Connecticut did not like. Eventually he changed his position so his party, which is also my party, would like it, and 2 years later he took a \$10,000 trip on NED as his reward. Now I know that was 1988, but I do not know if this practice has changed or not and neither does anyone else.

We hear accusations that certain groups are funded in contradiction. We hear, for instance, that the unions sometimes fund one group and the Chamber funds the opposite group. They are competing forces working at cross purposes.

It is obscene in my judgment, for the Republican Party, or Democrat Party, to be given Federal money. Why not some other political parties? Are we with Federal dollars institutionalizing these two parties? And what about labor and business? It's the same problem. We fund labor and we fund the U.S. Chamber of Commerce both. Neither are not going to oppose NED because they are both dipping their hands right in there. And when we fund both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, there is no countervailing force. Everyone is getting something so no one objects.

□ 1450

In closing I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], "You are a brave man. You are right on target." We may need an organization like NED to help fledgling democracies but we do not need these four institutes. We do not need lobbyists on these institutes. We do not need political fundraisers on these institutes. We do not need legislators on these institutes. We need to separate the Republican and Democrat Parties and the AFL-CIO and U.S. Chamber of Commerce from NED. If we don't we are simply giving taxpayer's money to organizations that are not accountable

to the President, Congress or the American people.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the National Endowment for Democracy's financial control and grant monitoring procedures are employed at every stage of the grant process for each of the 200 or so grants awarded annually, from a CETA proposal through grant award monitoring.

There is more oversight over NED and core grantee programs than there is over the State Department and AID programs set up in this whole process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Endowment for Democracy. In July I was privileged to travel with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BREUTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and others, with the Speaker's task force on inter-parliamentary cooperation, to Eastern and Central Europe. And I can only wish that all of our colleagues had been with us on that journey as we heard the testimony about NED's effectiveness from numerous Eastern European leaders, effectiveness made possible by the flexibility of NED's organizational and funding mechanisms.

We were all particularly struck in Albania by the credit repeatedly given to NED-financed programs as playing perhaps the critical role in bringing democracy to that country through free and fair parliamentary elections.

The same is true throughout Eastern Europe. Working with "Solidarity" in Poland to develop machinery to resolve labor disputes. Helping prepare a new citizenship education curriculum in Poland. Supporting the main organization in Bulgaria developing privatization policy, and supporting grass roots political education programs in Romania.

And then throughout the former Soviet Union: NED-sponsored local party training seminars for hundreds of political activists in Russia. 127 activists from across Central Asia coming together for 3 days of democratic education in Kazakhstan, developing an informational resource bank to assist entrepreneurs in Ukraine. And on and on.

The testimony is just overwhelming that NED continues to play a key role, not only in Eastern Europe, but in many emerging democracies around the world.

So let us not step back from this leadership. Let us step forward, to give these countries and these peoples the tools they sorely need at a critical time in their struggles to build democratic institutions that can weather the storms ahead.

This is a \$35 million appropriation. It represents modest support, but it is strategically targeted to make a real difference, to give democracy a chance in an often hostile world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUMBE). The Chair will advise Members designated to control time that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 3 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] has 5½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has 8¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], under the rule, reserves the right to close debate.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I guess like so many things in life, it is a question of priorities. When I hear people wave the fiscal flag, I applaud, because we are in trouble in terms of deficits and national debt. But, again, it is a question of priorities.

The last two gentlemen, who oppose the National Endowment for Democracy, and who are excellent Republicans and who are fiscally sound thinkers, it was their priority to support the final passage for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, worthy causes, to the tune of \$174.6 million. That is wonderful.

Now here we have the National Endowment for Democracy asking for a measly \$35 million, in comparison to the other endowments that subsidize street theater and some poetry and wonderful things. And, if we had that money, we should subsidize those things.

But democracy in 100 different countries is under siege. Again, it is a matter of priorities.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

(Mr. FINGERHUT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] when it came up the first time. I have, legitimately, as have many others, struggled with this decision, particularly so because so many people whose opinions I respect are on the other side of this question, particularly my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], with whom I serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I have no doubt, after listening to the arguments these last few weeks and today on the floor, that this program has great merit. Indeed, one of the points that has been made to me over

and over again is that this is precisely the kind of foreign aid program that we ought to pursue. This is new foreign aid. In fact, it is more accountable, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] said, than some of the old programs. It more directly goes to subsidize democracy than some of the old programs.

But what we have failed to do, if we want to support this new foreign aid, is what we have failed to do time and time again on this floor, and that is get rid of the old before we keep funding the new.

If we should fund this new foreign aid, if it is a better program, then let us cut that which is inefficient, cut that which does not have oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I was watching this debate up in the gallery with the Phillips Osborne School from my district. We took a picture on the steps of the Capitol and then we came upstairs.

I was watching this debate. I said, "Ladies and gentlemen of the school, this is really democracy at work, because this is a difficult question that your Representatives are struggling with." But what I have decided, as I stood up there, is that the future that I care about is them, and what we have got to do in terms of our priorities, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and others, is get this deficit under control when we are willing to cut away that which we should not do anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing and ready to support the new. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take up where the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] concluded. In the budget that our chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has passed in this conference report, which increases the National Endowment for Democracy by \$5 million, \$15 million less than the President, the conference report cuts \$72 million from State Department operating accounts; \$160 million, 28 percent, from foreign buildings; \$58 million, 12.8 percent, from peacekeeping; 5.7 percent, \$52 million, from international organizations; 13.1 percent, \$46 million below in international broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, these are all cuts below last year's level. The total, when you add the cuts in foreign aid, comes to over \$600 million in cuts. And, Mr. Speaker, we have done exactly what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] said. We have prioritized, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has prioritized, a small addition for an effort to promote democracy. Massive cuts in international relations, perhaps.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, America is face with a great post-cold-war challenge. American democratic values are being put to the test throughout the world. Americans have never run from a challenge, and they shouldn't start now.

I ask my colleagues to make up their minds. Do you want to support democracy so we may meet these challenges? Or would you want more headaches—headaches that will multiply if we reject this program?

The National Endowment for Democracy educates leaders and grassroots organizers so that they can consolidate the democratic process in their countries.

Does NED work? Ask former dissident, playwright and hero of the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, Vaclav Havel, now President of the free Czech Republic. President Havel officially cited NED for "building new democratic societies in Central and Eastern Europe."

Ask Polish dissident and labor leader, Lech Walesa, also now President of his country. Ask the Dalai Lama, who fights for a free Tibet. Ask President Aylwin of Chile, who helped end the Pinochet dictatorship. Ask the Organization of African Unity, or South Africans working for a nonracial democracy. Ask Boris Yeltsin.

Mr. Speaker, we won the cold war because we had principles. In the great American tradition, we stuck to those principles. Let us not turn our backs on democracy at this critical time. Support the National Endowment for Democracy.

□ 1500

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Smith motion and in support of \$35 million for the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Endowment of Democracy [NED] and in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees.

The promotion of democratic values serves U.S. national interests. A world where democracy flourishes is a safer and more prosperous one. Democratic governments rarely go to war with each other. Democracy also offers countries the best chance to solve their own problems, preventing them from becoming American problems.

The National Endowment for Democracy:

Plays a critical role in America's democracy promotion strategy.

Mobilizes America's private sector—labor, business, our two political parties, and numerous other private groups—to help people in dozens of nations working against great odds to build societies based on democratic principles, the rule of law, and respect for human rights.

Supports democratic forces when the U.S. Government cannot. Acting as private organizations, NED and its affiliates are able to work with groups unwilling or unable to take funding directly from the U.S. Government.

Is responsive to congressional concerns. NED initiated a series of management reforms in response to a 1991 GAO report. GAO praised NED's reforms in a follow-up review. NED has also increased internal auditing.

In my opinion, given the importance of its work, NED is a bargain. The \$35 million in funding proposed in the conference report is 30 percent less than the President requested.

Congress has already cut international affairs spending dramatically this year. Funding for NED will be drawn from cuts in less essential international programs. Shifting funds from the cold war programs to democracy-promotion is a sensible and responsible use of scarce U.S. resources.

NED has been praised by many of the world's most respected advocates of human rights and democracy, people who have worked for many years to promote democratic change in repressive societies. NED supporters include Elena Bonner of Russia, Oscar Arias of Costa Rica, the Dalai Lama of Tibet, Fred Chiluba of Zambia, Vytautas Landsbergis of Lithuania, and Fang Lizhi of China.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, does democracy have a chance in the Third World? That is what we are deciding here today. That is what it is all about. Does democracy have a chance in the Third World?

Vote against NED and Members are voting against democracy in the Third World, because it does not have a chance because no one else is going to be in there with the resources they need to create the democratic institutions.

Does democracy have a chance in some of these countries that are trying to evolve out of Soviet tyranny? A vote against NED is a vote to thwart the actual transition out of communism in some of these societies, societies that if they are democratic are no threat to us but as authoritarian with their hands on nuclear weapons pose a great threat to us.

The cold war is over. The new challenge is not thwarting communism. The new challenge we have in our generation is advancing democracy. Our security depends on democracy and the progress democracy will make in the Third World and those countries that have lived under tyranny.

We will have a more peaceful world if we have a freer world. NED will work for a freer world. It is a wise investment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The National Endowment for Democracy has served to enhance America's

image. In Africa, the Western Hemisphere, and the world, many institutions and organizations have fostered democratic efforts and principles because of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Isolationism and xenophobia will not assist us as a country in promoting better understanding between the peoples of the world. I strongly support the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Smith motion.

There have been problems with the Endowment, but the Endowment has endeavored to address these problems, and it is not relevant to talk about GAO reports of several years ago.

The Endowment is a partnership between the public and the private sector. We do this in a number of areas. It is a creative partnership. We ought to be proud of the efforts.

I received a letter from the American chairman of the Hungarian United States Business Council. He describes how the programs of NED are essential, and I quote:

*** to ensuring that democratic institutions are strengthened and economic reforms are sustained throughout Central Eastern Europe and the states of the former Soviet Union.

There has been talk here about fiscal responsibility, and it is very important. But let that flag not be used to be irresponsible when it comes to democratic institutions in other countries. We have a stake. It is important that the Endowment continues its work.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

What this debate demonstrates here this afternoon is not the power of democracy but the power of a label. If we put a label on something, it will pass.

National Endowment for Democracy, everyone wants to vote for democracy. Hey, wait a minute, do we have faith in democracy? Then why do we have to go around the world and propagandize it? Why do we have to go around the world and sell it?

If it is a great idea, it will sell itself. This is not an issue of democracy, my colleagues. This is an issue of whether we are going to give \$35 million of taxpayers' money to special interests in the United States.

Stop and analyze it. Who gets this money? The average people? No. It goes to special-interest groups to fly around the country.

I say to my friends, "If you want to do something for democracy, do it on your own time. Don't come to the Congress and ask for \$35 million. We have got all kinds of problems here in our country. We can use this money here. We don't have to spend it overseas."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair will advise those in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House of Representatives, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings on the floor is in violation of the spirit of that invitation.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of the conference committee's provision of funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. I want to express a word of appreciation to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), who has been exceedingly helpful to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when asked, and a word of appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who has been a remarkable leader in getting support for this bill.

The National Endowment for Democracy is a very small but very important program. In comparison to our overall efforts to protect and to promote our national interests, this is among the most important programs, even though the amount of money is very small.

All of us know that small investments can pay large dividends, and the National Endowment for Democracy is that kind of an investment.

It plays a critical role that the Government of the United States cannot play in furthering this country's political values around the globe, in promoting democracy and the rule of law, and in trying to safeguard basic human rights.

NED promotes democratic values, free and periodic elections, majority rule with protection for minority rights, the rule of law, and the respect for the dignity of each person.

We are a long way from that ideal, as all of us know, in the world, for all kinds of reasons. But we are moving in the right direction with our support of NED.

The distinguished National Security Adviser to the President, Tony Lake, gave a speech the other day in which he tried to set out a rationale to succeed the rationale of containment that had been the basis of American foreign policy for many years. He said that what we should do is to have a strategy of enlargement, enlargement of the world's free community of market democracies.

All of us, I think, subscribe to that kind of a doctrine. The question is, what are the tactics? That is a big question, but one of the most impor-

tant elements of the tactics will be the National Endowment for Democracy.

I strongly urge the approval of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As we are nearing the end of debate, the Chair would advise those Members designated to control time that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) has 2½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) has 1½ minutes remaining and reserves, under the rule, the right to close debate.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we parse this debate, if we cut right through, what essentially the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and his co-author, the gentleman from Connecticut, are saying is this: The NED has done some great work in the Philippines and in Chile and in Namibia and in Eastern Europe and in Albania, and yes, we want to promote democracy in republics of the former Soviet Union, and this is a critical issue, and we need to persevere.

However, what they are saying is, notwithstanding the great work that the National Endowment, through its grantees, has done, notwithstanding the incredible, formidable tasks that remain ahead, because my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ROTH) said, "But it is not so. If democracy is a good idea, it will take care of itself."

Ask the people who lived under Stalin and Bolshevism for 70 years, or the people occupied by Nazi Germany, or the people who have been living under Papa Doc and Baby Doc and all the dictators and tyrants in Haiti, whether democracy, if it is a good idea, will take care of itself and will not need assistance and work and help in fertilization and promotion.

What these gentleman are saying is, This is organized the wrong way. This is organized the wrong way. Then they throw out, at a time long after I thought McCarthyism was dead, without naming any names, that there are Members and there are staffers whose motivation for supporting NED is so corrupt that it is based on the fact that they may have taken a trip or gotten in one of these programs, without naming the Members, without naming the staffers. Maybe it was the two who almost died in Namibia working on the elections, the first free elections ever in the history of that successful transition to democracy.

Where are these specifics? They have never talked to me. They have never come to my staff. They have never come to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appro-

priations to get the list of Members that have taken trips or the staffers that have been granted them. They have no specific charges.

This is not the way to fight a program, but they missed the point in an even broader sense. It is because the NED succeeds, NED succeeds because of its organizational structure, not in spite of it, because of its funding arrangement. It exemplifies the benefits of reinventing Government.

In a dynamic and shifting environment, NED can respond to requests swiftly and appropriately. Sustainable democracy is built from the ground up, person-by-person, institution-by-institution. It is because of this structure that it is working.

If this was simply an agency of the Federal Government, believe me, it would not have this success rate and flexibility. I urge an aye vote on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of comment tonight, or this afternoon, but I have to agree with my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ROTH), that the real question is who is benefiting from these funds.

This whole argument is not about democracy. This country spends billions and billions and billions of dollars around the world for democracy, and in the last 10 years, trillions of dollars for democracy. This is an argument about special interest groups that have their hands in the Federal Treasury for their purposes, and it is an unholy bedfellow alliance.

It is disgraceful that the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, who are supposed to be watching each other, are supposed to be protecting the institutions of democracy in America, have formed together in an unholy alliance to pay for their travel around the world.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) tells us we can hear these names. Why do we have an exemption, that they do not even have to disclose trips paid by these institutes on official forms in the Government? If we can disclose these, why have we not seen these forms? Why do they not put their trips in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BERMAN. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I do not have the time. We spent an hour on this, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), and we have spent years.

This argument boils down to whether or not there is any project or program in America that we can cut to save money, and whether or not we can say no to special interest groups. It is not the National Endowment for Democracy, it is the National Endowment for the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the AFL-CIO, and the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce. It is not the National Endowment for Democracy, it is the Welfare Act for the Support of Political Consultants of 1993, as it has been for the last 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen more lobbying, more pressure brought upon the membership of this House over any issue this year than has been on this. We have had former Presidents of the United States as late as last night calling Members to change their vote from their June 22 vote. Why is it so vitally important? Even my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who I have the highest regard for, has voted against NED. I think he was right then, but he is entitled to his position now.

All I urge of the 110 new freshmen that came to this Congress, I would say to them, they were sent here by the American people to set priorities and not collapse in the face of pressure from special interest groups. It is sinful for the American democracy, and it puts our American democracy in jeopardy, when there is an unholy alliance between the two political parties to take the public taxpayers' money. It is a bad omen for our economic free system when labor and organized business get together and form an unholy alliance, spending taxpayers' money.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] put it very well. If they want to travel around the world to further democracy, let them use their own dime, and then we will be happy. If this is such a great program, why have they not raised private funds as a charity to fund their program?

I urge my colleagues in Congress to stand up, make a vote of courage and confidence today, hold with the vote of June 22 and vote no on the motion to recede.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I urge an aye vote, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the dialog this afternoon on the National Endowment for Democracy. I have never taken a dime from that endowment.

As I listened, I thought how easy it is to talk about democracy in the comfort of this Chamber, the comfort of this Nation. We had 150 years of colonial experience and evolving democracy prior to the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution of the United States. Since then we have had two centuries more of experience with democracy. It is not that easy for the rest of the world. They need Americans from all walks of life—labor, management, both sides of politics, and many sides of politics—to go abroad and share their experience. We need each one of us to teach many of them. That is the effort that will count if we are going to invest this small amount of money, \$35 million, and spread democracy around the world.

How much better if is to support the grassroots efforts of the National En-

dowment for Democracy than to run up another \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion in national expenditures because we will have to revitalize the defense forces of this country if some of these countries fall back into authoritarian practices. That \$35 million is the cheapest investment this Congress could make to promote democracy in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] to close debate.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult things for people to understand that have never lived in a democracy is how private institutions can make their own decisions. No one could help them better understand that than someone from a private institution, from a labor union, from a business, or from a political party. It is essential that we use those people. They do not need to have people with annual salaries. It is better that they have volunteers working with these countries and institutions.

The House was requested \$50 million by the administration. It voted down the \$50 million, but this amendment is for \$35 million. I repeat what the new President of Albania said. He said that the greatest help that his country could have—a lot greater than foreign aid or any grant, was the help that they got from the National Endowment for Democracy, because individuals from political parties, individuals from business, individuals from labor came over there and helped his people to understand how institutions, private institutions, make their own decisions and relate to the government.

□ 1520

The need has never been greater. We have more countries now that need this kind of help than ever before. They are emerging and ready to go into democratic institutions.

We have many democratic institutions in the Western countries, but now we have to do the same thing in the other parts of the world.

So I ask Members to support the \$35 million for NED.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of the National Endowment for Democracy.

The National Endowment for Democracy is a nonprofit organization which promotes democratic values, making U.S. national interests safer worldwide. It provides grants to projects for strengthening democratic institutions and processes. The NED funds projects in Russia, Ukraine, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Poland, the Philippines, and South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, major events are shaping our world; Russia will hold elections and vote on a constitution on December 12, 1993; democracy's roots are growing strong in Latin America; democratic institutions are rising out

of the ashes of communism in Eastern Europe; Asia continues to advance democratically and economically. The need for NED is clear. NED's record and global events demand our attention.

NED promotes respect for human rights. Bonner of Russia, Arias of Costa Rica, the Dalai Lama, Chiluba of Zambia, Landsbergis of Lithuania, and Lizhi of China have worked with and support the National Endowment for Democracy. Additionally, the NED supports U.S. interests when the U.S. Government is unable to influence a situation. Lastly, the NED provides timely and useful information to Congress on a variety of subjects. Let us not forget that the NED has remained responsive to congressional concerns through instituting managerial and accounting reforms.

Mr. Speaker, today we should vote to reduce NED's funding, not delete it. Today's vote will reduce NED's funding to \$35 million, fund a successful and efficient method of promoting democracy abroad, support the administration's request that NED be saved, and maintain our focus on building democratic institutions and processes aboard.

Mr. Speaker, the NED is not an organization inspired by the cold war. It is not ideologically motivated nor is it controlled by any private interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to fund the National Endowment for Democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). All time has expired. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the question be divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question will be divided.

The question is, will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 23, noes 17.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 172, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—259

Abercrombie	Bartlett	Bishop
Ackerman	Barton	Blackwell
Andrews (TX)	Bateman	Bliley
Armey	Becerra	Boehert
Bacchus (FL)	Bellenson	Bonilla
Bacchus (AL)	Bereuter	Bonior
Baker (CA)	Berman	Borski
Ballenger	Bliley	Boucher
Barlow	Blirakis	Brooks

Brown (CA)	Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hoke	Obeyesekere
Brown (OH)	Horn	Obeys
Bryant	Houghton	Oliver
Bunning	Hoyer	Ortiz
Burton	Huffington	Oxley
Bayer	Hughes	Packard
Calvert	Hunter	Pallone
Canady	Hutchinson	Pastor
Cardin	Hyde	Paxon
Castle	Inhofe	Payne (NJ)
Clayton	Ingle	Payne (VA)
Clement	Istook	Pelosi
Clinger	Jefferson	Penny
Clyburn	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Johnson (GA)	Pickle
Collins (IL)	Johnson (SD)	Pombo
Collins (MI)	Johnson, E.B.	Pomeroy
Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Porter
Coppersmith	Johnston	Portman
Cox	Kasich	Price (NC)
Crapo	Kennedy	Rahall
Cunningham	Kennelly	Reed
Darden	Kildee	Regula
de la Garza	Kim	Reynolds
Deal	King	Richardson
DeLauro	Kingston	Roberts
DeLay	Klein	Roemer
Deutch	Klink	Rogers
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Dickey	Kopetski	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Kreider	Rose
Dingell	Kyl	Rowland
Dixon	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Dooley	Lambert	Royce
Doornick	Lancaster	Rush
Dornan	Lantos	Sabo
Dreier	Laughlin	Sawyer
Dunn	Leach	Saxton
Durbin	Lehman	Schiff
Edwards (CA)	Levin	Schumer
Edwards (TX)	Levy	Scott
English (AZ)	Lewis (CA)	Sharp
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Shaw
Everett	Linder	Skaggs
Farr	Livingston	Skeen
Fazio	Lowey	Slaughter
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Smith (IA)
Flitner	Manton	Smith (NJ)
Fish	Markey	Smith (OR)
Flake	Martinez	Smith (TX)
Frank (NJ)	Mata	Spence
Frost	McCloskey	Spratt
Furse	McCollum	Swift
Gallo	McCrary	Synar
Gelderson	McCurdy	Tejeda
Gephardt	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Geren	McDermott	Thompson
Gibbons	McKeon	Thornton
Gilchrest	McMillan	Torres
Gillmor	McNulty	Torricelli
Gilman	Meek	Tucker
Gingrich	Menendez	Unsoeld
Glickman	Meyers	Vento
Goodlatte	Michel	Vucanovich
Goss	Miller (FL)	Walker
Green	Mineta	Walters
Gunderson	Minge	Watt
Gutierrez	Moakley	Waxman
Hall (TX)	Mohr	Wheat
Hamilton	Mollohan	Williams
Hansen	Moorhead	Wilson
Harman	Moran	Wise
Hastert	Morella	Wolf
Hastings	Murtha	Young (FL)
Hinchey	Nadler	Zeliff
Hoagland	Natcher	
Hobson	Neal (MA)	

NAYS—172

Allard	Camp	English (OK)
Andrews (ME)	Cantwell	Evans
Andrews (NJ)	Carr	Ewing
Applegate	Clay	Fawell
Archer	Coble	Fields (TX)
Basler	Collins (GA)	Fingerhut
Baker (LA)	Combest	Foglietta
Barca	Condit	Ford (MI)
Barclay	Conyers	Ford (TN)
Barrett (NE)	Costello	Fowler
Barrett (WI)	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bentley	Cramer	Frank (CT)
Bevill	Crane	Galleghy
Blute	Danner	Gekas
Boehner	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Brewster	Dellums	Goodling
Browder	Derrick	Gordon
Byrne	Duncan	Grams
Callahan	Emerson	Grandy

Greenwood	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Snowe
Hamburg	Mint	Solomon
Hancock	Montgomery	Stark
Hays	Murphy	Suarez
Hefner	Myers	Stenholm
Hefner	Nussle	Stokes
Herrger	Orton	Strickland
Hilliard	Owens	Studds
Hoekstra	Parker	Stump
Holden	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Hutto	Petri	Sundquist
Ingalls	Pickett	Swett
Jacobs	Poshard	Talent
Kanjorski	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
Kaptur	Quillen	Tauzin
Kleczka	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Klug	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
Knollenberg	Rangel	Thomas (WY)
LaRocco	Ravenel	Thurman
Lasio	Ridge	Torkildsen
Lewis (FL)	Rostenkowski	Towns
Lightfoot	Roth	Tracy
Lipinski	Roukema	Upton
Lloyd	Sanders	Valentine
Long	Sangmeister	Velazquez
Machtley	Santorum	Visclosky
Mann	Sarbanes	Volkmer
Mansullo	Schaefer	Walsh
Margolies	Schek	Washington
Mezvisky	Schroeder	Weldon
Maxwell	Sensenbrenner	Whitten
McCandless	Serrano	Woolsey
McHale	Shays	Wyden
McHugh	Shepherd	Wynn
McInnis	Shuster	Yates
McKinney	Sisk	Young (AK)
McMahon	Skellton	Zimmer
Mfume	Slattery	

NOT VOTING—2

Chapman Engel

□ 1542

Mssrs. BARRETT of Nebraska, GRAMS, HERGER, and HILLIARD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. LAFALCE, PETERSON of Florida, and CLINGER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is. Will the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 171?

The House concurred in the amendment of the Senate numbered 171.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, on the previous vote, on rollcall 521, I inadvertently voted "no" when I intended to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 174: Page 71, strike out lines 3 to 16.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

SEC. 606 (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance, to the extent feasible, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Head of the agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 607. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), overhaul, conversion, or modernization of vessels for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in shipyards located outside of the United States.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), conversion, or modernization of aircraft for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in facilities located outside the United States and Canada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 175: Page 71, after line 16, insert:

SEC. 607. (a) Funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation and distributed to each grantee funded in fiscal year 1994 pursuant to the number of poor people determined by the Bureau of Census to be within its geographical area shall be distributed in the following order: grants from the Legal Services Corporation and contracts entered into with the Legal Services Corporation for basic field programs shall be maintained in fiscal year 1994 and not less than 97.903 per centum of the annual level at which each grantee and contractor was funded in fiscal year 1993 pursuant to Public Law 102-395;

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by or contrary to any of the provisions of—

(1) section 607 of Public Law 101-515, and that, except for the funding formula, all funds appropriated for the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 and all references to "1991" in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 shall be deemed to be "1994" unless paragraph (2) or (3) applies;

(2) paragraph 1, except that, if a Board of eleven Directors is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, provisions 20 and 22 shall not apply;

(3) authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1994 for the Legal Services Corporation is enacted into law.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 608. (a) Funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation and distributed to each grantee funded in fiscal year 1994, pursuant to the number of poor people determined by the Bureau of the Census to be within its geographical area, shall be distributed in the following order:

(1) grants from the Legal Services Corporation and contracts entered into with the Legal Services Corporation under section 1006(a)(1) of the Legal Services Corporation Act, as amended, shall be maintained in fiscal year 1994 at not less than the annual level at which each grantee and contractor was funded in fiscal year 1993 pursuant to Public Law 102-395; and

(2) each grantee or contractor for basic field funds under section 1006(a)(1) shall receive an increase of not less than 2.5% over its fiscal year 1993 grant level. Any additional increase in funding for grants and contracts to basic field programs under section 1006(a)(1) shall be awarded to grantees and contractors funded at the lowest levels per-poor-person (calculated for each grantee or contractor by dividing each such grantee's or contractor's fiscal year 1993 grant level by the number of poor persons within its geographical area under the 1990 census) so as to fund the largest number of programs possible at an equal per-poor-person amount; and

(3) any increase above the fiscal year 1993 level for grants and contracts to migrant programs under section 1006(a)(1) shall be awarded on a per migrant and dependent basis calculated by dividing each such grantee's or contractor's fiscal year 1993 grant level by the state migrant and dependent population, which shall be derived by applying the state migrant and dependent population percentage as determined by the 1992 Larson-Plascencia study of the Tomas Rivera Center migrant enumeration project. This percentage shall be applied to a population figure of 1,661,875 migrants and dependents. These funds shall be distributed in the following order:

(A) forty percent to migrant grantees and contractors funded at the lowest levels per migrant (including dependents) so as to fund the largest number of programs possible at an equal per migrant and dependent amount; and

(B) forty percent to migrant grantees and contractors such that each grantee or contractor funded at a level of less than \$19.74 per migrant and dependent shall be increased by an equal percentage of the amount by which such grantee's or contractor's funding, including the increases under subparagraph (A) above, falls below \$19.74 per migrant and dependent, within its State; and

(C) twenty percent on an equal migrant and dependent basis to all migrant grantees and contractors funded below \$19.74 per migrant and dependent within its State.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by or contrary to any of the provisions of—

(1) section 607 of Public Law 101-515, and that, except for the funding formula, all funds appropriated for the legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as set forth in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 and all references to "1991" in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 shall be deemed to be "1994" unless subparagraph (2) or (3) applies;

(2) subparagraph 1, except that, if a Board of eleven Directors is nominated by the

President and confirmed by the Senate, provisions 20 and 22 shall not apply to such a confirmed Board;

(3) authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1994 for the Legal Services Corporation that is enacted into law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the funding included in the conference report for the Legal Services Corporation. This program provides much needed legal assistance to the indigent of this country. The funding level approved by the Conference Committee is by no means too much money. On the contrary, the poor across this country are being denied equal access to our Nation's system of justice simply because there are not enough resources. If you look at the statistics, they show that the Federal Government now provides less than 40 percent of the support necessary to achieve even minimum access to justice.

The appropriation agreed to by the conferees is necessary simply to bring the program back up to 1981 funding levels. The poor in 1991 were served by a third fewer legal services attorneys than were available to them in 1981. To meet the goal of providing minimum access—which is a mere two attorneys for every 10,000 poor people in the country—we would need to fund this program at \$823 million—more than twice the proposed appropriation. I find it truly remarkable that this Chamber can continue to fund ballistic missile defense—formerly known as SDI—to the tune of \$3 billion a year and at the same time attempt to slash funds for this program when studies show that over 60 percent of indigent people in need of help are turned away on a regular basis because there are no resources available. What kind of justice is that? This is not the justice guaranteed by our Constitution.

This appropriation should receive the support of each and every member here who represent poor people. The last census indicates that nearly one-fourth of the entire population is living at 125 percent of the poverty level or below. While poverty may not be a prevalent problem in some of your districts, I am not so fortunate. In my home State of North Dakota, 14.5 percent of the population live in poverty while the national average is only 13.5 percent. And yet, the percentage of people receiving public assistance in North Dakota is one of the lowest in the Nation. Legal assistance of North Dakota, or LAND—which provides legal expertise and know-how to low-income people in my State—faces not only widespread poverty but also problems of geography. LAND must serve the entire State with only four law offices.

Americans have a fundamental right to seek justice. This should be guaranteed regardless of where they live, how much they make, or the color of their skin. Again, the statistics show that the indigent are underserved: The general population can claim one attorney for every 320 people, while the poor in this country have only one legal services attorney per nearly 7,000 people.

I urge my colleagues to support the appropriation approved by the Conference Committee. We presume equal access is guaranteed by our Constitution. This appropriation puts us

one step closer toward making equal access a reality for the poor of our Nation.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2519, the bill that funds the Commerce, Justice and State Departments, the Federal judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1994.

First, I would like to commend Chairman NEIL SMITH and the conferees for meeting the challenge that was before them. The conferees were able to set priorities in determining the funding levels for the various agencies and programs that this conference report supports, given the fiscal restraints they faced. But, the funding level in the resulting conference report is not only below the subcommittee's target, as set by the Appropriations Committee based on this year's budget resolution. It is also less than the amount requested by the President, and below last year's funding level.

The Commerce-Justice-State conference report supports a diverse number of agencies and programs. They include community policing efforts, law enforcement against organized crime, the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], and our Federal prisons; the operation of our national fisheries and our marine, weather, environmental and satellite programs; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the National Weather Service, and the Small Business Administration.

The conference report's support of the President's new Immigration Initiative is of tremendous importance to California, given the serious problems that we are having with illegal immigration. It targets funds for additional land border inspectors, additional border patrol agents, increased pre-inspection at airports, and more asylum officers. The conference report also increases immigration inspection fees on foreigners entering the country by plane or boat from \$5 to \$6—an increase that is expected to raise \$50 million.

The conference report provides grants to State and local law enforcement agencies to assist them in safeguarding our neighborhoods and communities. It also supports juvenile justice programs, FBI start-up costs for creating a national background check system, and a new community policing effort so that State and local governments can put more officers on the street and employ innovative techniques to prevent crime.

The Small Business Administration—known for its direct and guaranteed loan assistance to small businesses—is funded by this conference report, as is the Economic Development Administration [EDA]. The EDA, in turn, supports the efforts of my district's Tri-County Economic Development Corporation [TCEDC], which was formed in 1985 to serve as the economic development planning and coordinating agency for Butte, Glenn, and Tehama Counties. Over the past 8 years, TCEDC has financed a revolving loan fund that has worked in partnership with private lenders to provide loans to small businesses, creating over 250 jobs. Without the financial support provided in this conference report, economic development programs in these three counties would be seriously jeopardized.

Also important to my constituents is the conference report's support of SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics. SEARCH is comprised of Governors' appointees for all States. These appointees are dedicated to assisting State and

local criminal justice agencies in building, operating and improving their computer systems to combat crime, all at no cost. In the past, SEARCH has assisted the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Crime Analysis Unit in mapping a series of car-jackings that took place at gunpoint in the Sacramento area; this mapped information was then distributed to patrol forces. SEARCH also helped the Sutter County Sheriff's Department examine two computer disks that were suspected of containing evidence in a homicide case.

The programs funded in this conference report safeguard our children, neighborhoods and communities, and preserve our resources. They protect our industries, both locally and globally, and help us maintain our position as an international leader—economically, socially and politically. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for maintaining our quality of life to and support final passage of this conference report.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title.

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Building and grounds for events to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the Capitol.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2492), an act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House and agrees to a further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MACK, and Mr. HATFIELD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1994

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 279 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 279

Resolved, That during the consideration of amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement, and the motion printed in section 2 of this resolution, shall be considered as read. Points of order under clause 7 of rule XVI against the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 24, 81, 102, 123, and 125, and the motion printed in section 2 of this resolution to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, are waived.

SEC. 2. The motion to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 is as follows:

"Mr. Yates moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this head shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only. At this time I yield the customary 30 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 279 provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2520, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

The rule provides that the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report and the motion printed in section 2 of the rule shall be considered as read.

House Resolution 279 waives clause 7 of rule XVI—which prohibits non-germane amendments—against the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement to dispose of the Senate amendments numbered 10, 24, 81, 102, 123 and 125, and the motion printed in section 2 to dispose of the Senate amendment numbered 18.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of this rule so that we can consider this important conference report.

I would like to commend Chairman YATES and ranking Republican RALPH REGULA and their staff for crafting this conference agreement. I think every Member knows this conference committee worked long hours and dealt with complicated and contentious issues. I would like to thank them for their dedication and diligence.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON], has thoroughly explained the provisions of this rule. I want to reiterate that this rule waives

no points of order against the conference agreement—it only provides germaneness waivers against motions to dispose of seven amendments reported in disagreement. Although I do not generally support waiving germaneness rules, these waivers seem necessary in order to properly dispose of these amendments in disagreement. Therefore, I will support this rule.

This Interior appropriations bill has been the subject of much controversy, particularly on the grazing fee issue and funding for the National Biological Survey. I commend Chairman SID YATES and RALPH REGULA, the ranking Republican, and all the conferees for their hard work.

I do want to express my concern over funding for the National Biological Survey contained in this bill. The NBS is a major new proposal, and the authorization bill is still pending further consideration by the House. I hope we can move that measure soon so that the \$165.5 million appropriated is justified by an authorization bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and urge its adoption.

□ 1550

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and would like to advise the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] that I have all the time, the 30 minutes, allocated.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman does have all his time allocated?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am going to use all of my time, Mr. Speaker, and, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] would like me to yield time now, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. GORDON. We have no requests for time right now, Mr. Speaker, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. Secretary Babbitt's National Biological Survey has struck fear in the hearts of many Americans, especially those living in the West. Every single Member of this House should also be concerned about creating a brand new Federal agency through the appropriations process. The National Biological Survey is not authorized and in fact was pulled from this floor because of the heavy opposition and the numerous amendments that were made by this body.

On October 6 this House debated the National Biological Survey and added several amendments, including protections for private property, peer review guidelines, a prohibition against using untrained volunteers, and others. Chairman STUDDS has agreed to accept several other amendments including a wildlife amendment to preserve migratory bird research and hunting. None of these protections are included in the